



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2006

No. 28

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 7, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM PRICE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member other than the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

THE SOLOMON AMENDMENT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld a Federal law ensuring that colleges and universities who receive Federal funds permit open access for military recruiting on their campus. This ruling will allow the United States military to recruit the best and the brightest this Nation has to offer and will also greatly enhance our national security. I commend the Supreme Court for upholding this law.

This issue is of particular interest to me. I attended college on an Air Force

ROTC scholarship and know firsthand the importance of the Armed Forces. Therefore, in order for the United States to win the global war on terrorism, the Armed Forces need access to the highest caliber of people, and that is why we must ensure equal access for military recruiters.

In 1996, Congress enacted a provision of law that came to be known as the Solomon amendment. This provision is named for our former colleague from New York and former Rules Committee chairman, the late Jerry Solomon. This provision provides for the Secretary of Defense to deny Federal funding to colleges and universities if they do not provide military recruiters entry to campuses and access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided to any other employer.

The Solomon amendment was made necessary when a number of universities began restricting the access of military recruiters because of disagreement with certain military policies, such as the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the entire list of these universities in the RECORD.

Monday's ruling stems from a challenge from a group of law schools on the constitutionality of the Solomon amendment. A number of universities are denying equal access to military recruiters in protest of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy. Last year, I had an amendment on the floor that was patterned after the Solomon amendment, and it also passed.

Mr. Speaker, some of the universities who are denying equal access to military recruiters, are also receiving millions and millions of hardworking Americans' tax dollars every year in terms of research dollars and other things.

Harvard Law School, for example, allowed military recruiters to interview students at the offices of its Veterans

Association, but did not use its open personnel to set up the interviews as it did for other recruiters. In the wake of the Supreme Court hearing last fall, Harvard has reversed its decision and now plans to fully cooperate with the military recruiters.

Another example is Yale Law School, who had been letting recruiters use a room to meet with students, but had not been helping to arrange the interviews, as they did with other recruiters. These universities allow IBM, General Electric and other corporations full access, but not the military.

Equal access for military recruiters is an urgent issue. With the U.S. engaged in the global war on terrorism, it is more important than ever for the Armed Forces to recruit high-quality, well-qualified and well-trained personnel. This is why it is so important that the Supreme Court made such a strong statement in support of full and equal access to military recruiters on campus.

Chief Justice John Roberts, who wrote for the courts, said that the Solomon amendment "neither limits what law schools may say nor requires them to say anything. Law schools remain free under the statute to express whatever views they may have on the military's congressionally mandated employment policy. Nothing about recruiting suggests that the law schools agree with any speech by recruiters, and nothing in the Solomon amendment restricts what the law schools may say about the military's policies."

The Court went on to say that the law regulates conduct, not speech, and the hosting of recruiters is not expressive conduct that sends out a message as a former protest.

Mr. Speaker, so in conclusion, once again, I commend the Supreme Court for unanimously upholding the Solomon amendment. As the U.S. is engaged in the global war on terrorism, it is more vital than ever to our national

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H573

security that the United States Armed Forces have access to recruit the best people to serve in this country.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From SolomonResponse.Org]

FAIR PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS

The members of FAIR willing to be named publicly are:

1. The Faculty of Capital University Law School
 2. The Faculty of Chicago-Kent College of Law
 3. The Faculty of City University of NY (CUNY) Law School
 4. The Faculty of DePaul University College of Law
 5. The Faculty of University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law
 6. The Faculty of Fordham University School of Law
 7. The Faculty of Georgetown University Law Center
 8. George Washington University Law School
 9. Golden Gate University School of Law
 10. The Faculty of Hofstra University Law School
 11. The Faculty of the John Marshall School of Law
 12. New York Law School
 13. New York University School of Law
 14. Northeastern University School of Law
 15. The Faculty of the University of Minnesota Law School
 16. The Faculty of Pace University School of Law
 17. The Faculty of the University of Puerto Rico School of Law
 18. The Faculty of Roger Williams University Ralph R. Papitto School of Law
 19. The Faculty of the University of San Francisco School of Law
 20. The United Faculty of Stanford Law School
 21. The Faculty of Suffolk University Law School
 22. Vermont Law School
 23. The United Faculty of Washington University School of Law
 24. The Faculty of Whittier Law School
- faculties: 24 (18 public)
institutions: 12 (6 public)

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, THE NATIONAL UNIFORMITY FOR FOOD ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4167, the National Uniformity for Food Act. If passed, this bill will be a huge setback to consumer safety, public health and America's war on terror. This bill wipes out over 80 State food safety laws and puts our Nation's food safety standards squarely in the hands of the FDA.

State laws that will be overturned include warnings as to the risk of cancer, birth defects, reproductive health issues and allergic reactions associated with sulfiting agents in bulk food. That is why 37 State attorney generals, Democrats and Republicans, oppose this bill. A bipartisan Association of Food and Drug officials also have strong concerns about the legislation.

Let me quote from them. It says, this bill, H.R. 4167, "undermines our Nation's whole biosurveillance system by preempting and invalidating many of the State and local food safety laws and regulations that provide necessary authority for State and local agencies to operate food safety and security programs. The pre-9/11 concept embodied in this bill is very much out of line with the current threats that confront our food safety and security system."

The Association of Food and Drug Officials also said that H.R. 4167 will severely hamper the FDA's ability to detect and respond to acts of terrorism. Again, quoting from this report, it says our current food safety and security system will be significantly disrupted, and our inability to track suspected acts of intentional alteration will be exploited by those who seek to do our Nation harm.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to these two pictures. Which meat do you think is older, the red meat on top or the brown meat on the bottom? It is not really a trick question, but both of these packages of meat were packaged at the same time. Both have been sitting in a refrigerator side by side for 5 months. The meat on the top has been packaged with carbon monoxide which causes the meat to look fresh and red long into the future. The meat on the bottom has not been treated with carbon monoxide. It is brown and it is slimy.

Like I said, the meat on the top is 5 months old and looks as good as new, but it is not. If consumed, you could become severely ill from a food-borne pathogen like E. coli and possibly die from the red meat here on the top.

The FDA, without any independent study, has no objection to allowing meat to be packaged in carbon monoxide. The FDA merely reviewed the meat industry's carbon monoxide proposal. Review is not the same as independent research. By allowing the injection of carbon monoxide in meat and seafood packaging, the meat industry stands to gain \$1 billion per year because meat begins to turn brown. When it does, consumers reject it.

Consumers rely on color to determine freshness. Numerous studies from 1972 to 2003 cite color as the most important factors consumers use to determine what meat to buy. The whole purpose behind this carbon monoxide packaging is to extend the shelf life of meat and seafood and to deceive the consumer into thinking the product is fresh. Today, States may pass their own laws and put labels on meat that has been packaged with carbon monoxide, but those laws will be overturned if this bill, H.R. 4167, becomes law.

I will be offering an amendment which allows States to label carbon monoxide packaging of meat, so consumers will know the meat may not look as fresh as it may appear.

Is this really the standard we want for our country? Do we offer low car-

bon monoxide in meat packaging to make it look fresher, to stay on the shelf longer, and expose our country and consumers to the health and risk of eating contaminated meat and seafood? Public health and safety for food primarily have been the responsibility of States. We should not tie the hands of States who want to protect the health of their citizens. I urge my colleagues to support the Stupak carbon monoxide labeling amendment and vote "no" on H.R. 4167.

ADDRESSING THE ROOT CAUSE OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, under the leadership of our colleagues JIM KOLBE and JOHN CORNYN, a bipartisan, bicameral delegation attended the 45th meeting of the U.S.-Mexico Inter-Parliamentary group that was held in Mexico. The House Members, on Saturday, then went to the Mexico-Arizona border. We had the opportunity there to meet with local law enforcement officials and hospital administrators to discuss the tremendous strain that illegal immigration imposes on resources and law and order in our communities.

As an advocate of greater security at our borders, I have long supported addressing the root cause of illegal immigration, and that is a lack of economic opportunity that exists at home for the people in Mexico. We know that the majority of illegal immigrants come to this country for one very simple reason. They are seeking economic opportunity. They want to better their lives. They want to feed their families. Economic growth, job creation, and higher wages in Mexico are special components to a long-term solution to the very serious problem of illegal immigration.

By pursuing an open trade agenda that expands economic engagement in this hemisphere, we are not only shoring up our regionally based economy, and creating new opportunities for the United States workers, we are benefiting workers, the business owners and investors as well.

Mr. Speaker, we are hoping to drive the economic growth necessary to reduce the number of illegal immigrants who are trying to make that dangerous trek across the border, doing so simply because of the fact that they are wanting, as I said, to feed their families. It was therefore with great interest that I read a recent Business Week article describing the emergence of a growing middle class in our neighbor to the south.

The success of the North American Free Trade Agreement can be seen in the greater economic stability outlined in this Business Week piece. It talked

about steady growth, tame inflation, climbing wages and falling interest rates. This increasingly stable and healthy economic environment has helped Mexico become, and I quote from the Business Week article, a middle-class nation where millions have access to mortgages, solid jobs provide security, and a class of strivers saves to put its kids through college.

Mr. Speaker, Mexico's middle class has grown to over 10 million families or 40 percent of all the households in Mexico. Business Week also credits home ownership as another key factor in the emergence of a robust middle class. Strong economic fundamentals have slashed mortgage rates in half in just 2 years. The growing ranks of Mexican homeowners buttresses middle-class growth by allowing families to build equity, plan for their financial futures and move further up the economic ladder.

The middle class has also been able to afford additional consumer goods. Last year, auto sales in Mexico were up 33 percent from 2000 as a record 1.3 million cars and trucks were purchased. Home appliance sales have tripled in the past decade. Even extras like concert tickets and sporting events tickets are increasingly accessible to the average working family.

Mr. Speaker, most of us would not consider refrigerators or baseball games to be major luxuries. But for a country that has struggled greatly with poverty and deep economic crises, these are signs of tremendous economic progress. They are proof that our policy of economic engagement through agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement are working to bring new opportunities for the people in Mexico and also for the people right here in the United States.

They are an important step forward in ensuring that the swollen ranks of illegal immigrants are losing their incentive to come here illegally to find opportunity. Mexican officials are demonstrating the fact that they recognize the reality of the problem of illegal immigration as well. On February 16th, the Mexican Congress adopted a resolution that acknowledged the graveness of the illegal immigration issue and outlined the principles of its agenda to combat the problem. This resolution cited economic opportunity as critical to a successful campaign to prevent illegal immigration to the United States and to encourage the return of migrants to their homes in Mexico.

I am encouraged by the Mexican Parliament's bold language in accepting responsibility for action, and putting forth the outline of a plan. I am heartened that economic growth is central to Mexico's long-term strategy, because we know a growing Mexican middle class is a shrinking illegal immigrant class.

With greater hope for the future, there is a greater incentive to stay and build a life at home. Mexico is pledging to remain committed to a pro-growth

agenda. We must remain equally committed to an open trade agenda that helps our southern neighbor to continue down a path of economic growth and greater opportunity.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord our God, around the upper part of this Chamber are profile medallions which recall the personal history of lawmaking. In the center, full-faced and bold before us, is the image of Moses, the great lawgiver of the Hebrew scriptures.

May the people of this Nation and, in particular, those elected to the 109th Congress, who gather here to protect and guide this Nation, be faithful to Your commands.

Your revelation, Lord, gives us nothing less than the lessons we need to address the issues of the day. Your commandments are the foundations on which we build hope. They are the supports which strengthen faith in public action and the food which nourishes the human heart.

By obeying Your laws, those in representative government inspire those they represent, the governed. To internalize Your commands and live according to Your Word is to lead to fulfillment and bring promise to a disillusioned world, when left on its own.

Therefore, in the midst of everything, from You, Lord our God, we choose to draw wisdom and strength, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THORNBERRY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 6, 2006, at 11:05 am:

That the Senate Passed with an amendment and requests a conference with the House on H.R. 2830.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109-384) on the resolution (H. Res. 645) requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 109-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 641) requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants on individuals in the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE BARE FACTS ON THE ECONOMY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a bit tired of hearing some of my colleagues in the Democrat Party mislead the American people into thinking our economy is in poor shape. Here are the facts, plain and simple.

Our economy has been growing for 17 straight quarters. The National Association for Business Economics predicts the economy will grow at a 4.5 percent rate in the first quarter of 2006. After inflation, disposable incomes increased 2.2 percent in the last 12 months. The Federal Reserve reported that the median net worth of U.S. households increased 1.5 percent between 2001 and 2004. January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, which is the lowest monthly rate since 2001 and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of spin from the left can change the fact that our economy is growing stronger every day under Republican leadership.

RENEWAL OF U.S. PATRIOT ACT

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act today is literally a matter of life or death because it is helping us to win the war on terrorism.

Since we passed the PATRIOT Act in 2001, we have convicted 212 terrorists, and we have frozen \$136 million in terrorists' assets.

Reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act is purely a matter of common sense. Is it not common sense that we give law enforcement the same tools to go after terrorists as they now have to go after Mafia dons and drug dealers? Is it not common sense that we can now share data between the intelligence community and the law enforcement community? Is it not common sense that we track deadly terrorists, even though they cross jurisdictional lines or switch cell phones?

I am pleased that the Senate recently voted 89-10 to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. This legislation provides 30 new civil liberty safeguards and strengthens our port security by providing law enforcement authorities with new authority to secure our ports.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the PATRIOT Act.

TALIBAN AT YALE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the leftward drift of American higher education has been well documented. On the modern-day campus, nothing is too extreme and all ideas and political philosophies are declared equal in the name of tolerance, often producing ridiculous results.

The most recent example comes from Yale University. In the name of tolerance and diversity, administrators there have enrolled a member of one of the most radically intolerant and non-diverse groups in recent history, the Taliban.

A few years ago, Sayed Rahmatullah Hashemi was a spokesman for Afghanistan's Taliban regime, the same regime that provided safe haven for the 9/11 terrorists and brutally oppressed women and non-Muslims. Today, he is in the Ivy League, a student at Yale.

Rahmatullah said it best himself: "I could have ended up at Guantanamo Bay. Instead, I ended up at Yale."

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a point where elite universities like Yale will tolerate the Taliban on their campus but will not tolerate the ROTC, political correctness in the extreme.

ECONOMY AND FISCAL RESTRAINT

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are some days that it probably is a little depressing to be a mainstream media reporter.

In their world, our economy is sinking and the war on terrorism is absolutely hopeless.

Thankfully, in the real world, Americans know that we have drastically impacted al Qaeda's ability to attack us, and our economy is booming. Yes, it is booming.

We are expecting growth this quarter somewhere around 4 percent or more, and that means jobs. We have created almost 5 million new jobs and had 3 years of strong, solid economic growth.

When you compare our economy to Europe, to most nations, we are in an amazing era. Unemployment is below 5 percent. That is outstanding, and it is a shame that the mainstream reporters just cannot get the story right.

Our tax policies reduced the burden of taxation on Americans, and they have responded as they always do, by creating new jobs.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month.

As we remember the great women of past generations, we must also salute those women who are serving as role models and leaders today.

One such woman is Tammy Cohen of Marietta, Georgia, my district. Tammy is cofounder and president of InfoMart, and under her guidance, InfoMart has grown from a small startup business to the largest female-owned background checking company in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Tammy's success as a female entrepreneur is inspiring, and

while she is deeply respected for her business know-how, she is equally praised for her compassion and willingness to help.

When Hurricane Katrina struck the gulf coast last year, Tammy led a group of InfoMart employees who rented vans, gathered supplies and drove to New Orleans to rescue 15 children and 20 caretakers from a boys' home in Louisiana. Tammy then worked with community groups and local businesses in Marietta to house, feed and clothe these hurricane victims.

Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, it is important to honor those women who are making a difference in the lives of others. Tammy Cohen is undoubtedly one of these women.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating her accomplishments.

SUPREME COURT DELIVERS A VICTORY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and a father of three sons serving in the military, I frequently have an opportunity to meet with the dynamic young men and women of the U.S. military. I am always encouraged to hear them describe their pride as Americans and their strong sense of duty to their country. After witnessing the horrific attacks of September 11, these young people understand that their generation will protect our freedoms in the future.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously to ensure that men and women at colleges and universities will continue to have an opportunity to learn about serving in the United States military. America's Armed Forces have created the broadest spread of freedom in the history of the world, which protects American families. By allowing military recruiters to visit college campuses, the Court has ensured that the United States will remain the best military in the world.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

REAUTHORIZING OF PATRIOT ACT

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress will send to the President of the United States the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act. Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER and other members of the Judiciary Committee and the conference committee are to be commended for their effort in putting together a bill that balances the liberty and security interests of the American people.

This is an issue that is not just rhetorical for me, Mr. Speaker. I not only

serve on the House Judiciary Committee, but I was here on September 11, and I served on the committee as we built the PATRIOT Act in the immediate days following that national tragedy. That is why making 14 of the 16 provisions of the PATRIOT Act permanent is a critical element of ensuring the security of the American people, and putting safeguards on the two remaining provisions is evidence of a careful balancing act that has been accomplished in a bipartisan way.

We must equip law enforcement and intelligence officials with the tools necessary to protect our Nation from terrorist attacks. We must also safeguard the civil liberties of the American people to fulfill the vision of freedom.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues, with gratitude to our leadership, to move this PATRIOT Act to the President today.

□ 1415

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC., March 6, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 6, 2006, at 4:42 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits draft legislation entitled, "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006".

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 2006—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 109-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my State of the Union Address, I asked the Congress to give the President a line item veto. Today, I am sending the Congress a legislative proposal to give the President line item authority to reduce wasteful spending. This legislation will help to limit spending and ensure accountability and transparency in the expenditure of taxpayer funds.

Although the Congress achieved significant spending restraint this past

year, appropriations and other bills that are sent to my desk still contain spending that is not fully justified, is a low priority, or is earmarked to avoid the discipline of competitive or merit-based reviews. When this legislation is presented to me, I now have no ability to line out unnecessary spending. In 1996, the Congress gave the President a line item veto—an important tool to limit wasteful spending—but the Supreme Court struck down that version of the law in 1998.

My proposed legislation, the "Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006," would provide a fast-track procedure to require the Congress to vote up-or-down on rescissions proposed by the President. There has been broad bipartisan support for similar proposals in the past. Under this proposal, the President could propose legislation to rescind wasteful spending, and the Congress would be obligated to vote quickly on that package of rescissions, without amendment. The same procedure would apply to new mandatory spending and to special interest tax breaks given to small numbers of individuals.

Forty-three Governors have a line item veto to reduce spending. The President needs similar authority to help control unjustified and wasteful spending in the Federal budget. I urge you to promptly consider and send me this legislation for enactment to reduce unnecessary spending and help achieve my goal of cutting the deficit in half by 2009.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 2006.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BARBARA CUBIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BARBARA CUBIN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2006.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena, issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BARBARA CUBIN,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

GERARD A. FIORENZA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3934) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GERARD A. FIORENZA POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3934, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), would designate the post office in Massapequa, New York, as the Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building. As the postmaster general of Massapequa, Jerry Fiorenza was a vital member of the community, someone who was always available to help out where needed.

His first position with the postal service was as a postal assistant in Jamaica, New York, in 1972. As a letter carrier, he received a letter of recommendation, and in 1990 he was assigned as the officer in charge to the Valley Stream office. He then served as postmaster in Hewlett, Massapequa Park, and finally Massapequa.

While serving in Massapequa, he was known for his strict attention to detail and his friendly demeanor. In fact, the Massapequa Post publisher, Alfred James, is quoted as saying: "When I first came to Massapequa a few years ago as the publisher of the Massapequa Post, it was Jerry who was there to answer all of my questions and help me

whenever a problem arose. Jerry was committed to his profession and to the community and prided himself in providing the best possible postal service."

Along with serving in this capacity, Jerry Fiorenza was also involved in many other organizations, such as the Combined Federal Campaign, the United Way, and Toys for Tots. Locally, aside from being a member of the National Association of Postal Supervisors and a postmaster representative, he also served as a member of the Massapequa Chamber of Commerce, the Sons of Italy, the Columbia Association, American Legion Post 1066, and the Republican Club. In addition, he was named Massapequa's Man of the Year in 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in recognizing this beloved and respected member of the Massapequa community by passing H.R. 3934.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3934, legislation naming the postal facility in Massapequa, New York, after Gerard A. Fiorenza. This measure was sponsored by Representative Peter King on September 28, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on November 16, 2005. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

Gerard Fiorenza, a native of New York, was born in Brooklyn, attended St. Anthony of Padua Elementary School, graduated from Brooklyn Academy, and attended Queens Community College. Later, he moved his family to Massapequa and began his career with the U.S. Postal Service as a postal assistant. He was promoted to station manager and then officer in charge before attaining the rank of postmaster of the Massapequa Post Office.

A respected member of his community, Postmaster Fiorenza was active in postal management organizations such as the National Association of Postal Supervisors, NAPS; the National Association of Postmasters of the United States; and local organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, United Way, and Toys for Tots.

Sadly, he passed away, following a battle with cancer, on December 7, 2001. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Postmaster Gerard Fiorenza and urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3934, legislation that would designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 80 Killian Road in Massapequa, New York, as the "Gerard A. Fiorenza Post Office Building."

I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to Jerry Fiorenza than to name the post office in Massapequa where he worked in honor of him. I am proud to have introduced this legislation and to have the support of the entire

New York delegation. Jerry, a native of Brooklyn, worked for the Postal Service for nearly 30 years starting as a postal assistant and rising to serve as postmaster in Hewlett, Massapequa Park, and Massapequa. He also served as president of the National Association of Post Masters, NAPUS, and was deeply involved in his community serving as a member of the Massapequa Chamber of Commerce, the Sons of Italy, the Columbia Association, and American Legion Post 1066. In 2001 Jerry was selected as Massapequa's Man of the Year.

Jerry was also a devoted husband to his wife, Carol, and loving father to his two children, Michael and Jessica. He is truly missed by so many on Long Island.

I urge the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 3934 to honor Jerry Fiorenza, a public servant and community leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3934.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4054) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4054

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6110 East 51st Place in Tulsa, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4054, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN). This bill would designate the post office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office Building.

Dewey Bartlett was born in Marietta, Ohio, on March 28, 1919. He was educated in the Marietta public school system and later went on to attend Princeton University. While in college, he returned home during his summers to work in the Oklahoma oil fields. In 1945, after serving in the military during World War II, he moved to Tulsa to assume a managing role in his family's business.

Dewey Bartlett's political career started in 1963, when he became an Oklahoma State senator. He then ran successfully for Governor of Oklahoma and served in this capacity for 5 years. Finally, in 1972, he was elected to the United States Senate, where he served until 1979.

During his service in government, Bartlett was dedicated to a strong national defense. He also fought for a lean government, with limited layers of bureaucracy, which he felt was important to protect the constitutional guarantees of individual liberty, freedom, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to come together to honor a man who promoted excellence in government by passing H.R. 4054.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4054, legislation naming a postal facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma, after Dewey F. Bartlett. This measure was sponsored by Representative JOHN SULLIVAN of Oklahoma on October 7, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on February 1, 2006. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire Oklahoma delegation.

Dewey Bartlett was born and raised in Marietta, Ohio. He later attended Lawrenceville Preparatory School in New Jersey and graduated from Princeton University. During World War II, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps as a dive-bomber pilot in the South Pacific. After the war, Dewey Bartlett moved to Oklahoma, working as a farmer, rancher, and independent oil producer.

Politics called and Mr. Bartlett was elected to the State senate in 1962. Four years later, he made a successful run for Governor. He was recognized for his efforts in economic development, which benefited all Oklahomans, and for working in a bipartisan manner.

In 1972, Governor Bartlett was elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served

from 1973 to 1979. He did not seek reelection because he was battling lung cancer. Sadly, he passed away in Tulsa, Oklahoma, on March 1, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy of Senator Dewey F. Bartlett by naming a postal facility in his hometown, and I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of my bill, H.R. 4054, which will designate the 6110 East 51st Place post office in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office.

Dewey F. Bartlett was a strong advocate for conservative values. A war veteran and public servant for Oklahoma and the Nation, he served as the second Republican Governor of Oklahoma and is a distinguished alumnus of the United States Senate.

□ 1430

He was a true representative of Oklahoma values, leadership and drive. I am pleased that we are able to honor him in this way.

After graduating from Princeton University in 1942, Dewey Bartlett served in the Marine Corps as a combat dive-bomber during World War II. As a result of his courageous efforts in the South Pacific theater, he was awarded the Air Medal.

After the war, he moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma, and became a farmer, rancher and oil man. He was a partner in Keener Oil Company, one of the oldest independent oil companies. In 1963, Bartlett began his career in public service by joining the State senate, and in 1967 he became Oklahoma's 19th Governor. One of his priorities while in office was increasing industry in Oklahoma. As Governor, the results of his hard work helped to produce a record \$148.4 million in new industries or improvements on existing facilities and create an additional 7,500 jobs for Oklahomans.

From 1972 to 1978, Bartlett served as a Member of the United States Senate. During his tenure, this proud Oklahoman maintained a strong and consistent stance of limiting government bureaucracy, reducing burdensome taxes, and maintaining fiscal responsibility. I am proud to share Dewey Bartlett's vision of conservatism, and work daily towards the goal of promoting commonsense Oklahoma values in Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation. By designating the Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office in Tulsa, we are commemorating an exceptional citizen who embodied the Oklahoma spirit.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of H.R.

4054, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4054.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HIRAM L. FONG POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2089) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, as the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HIRAM L. FONG POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1271 North King Street in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, shall be known and designated as the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill S. 2089 offered by Senator AKAKA. This bill would designate the post office in Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Hiram L. Fong Post Office Building."

Hiram Fong was born on the island of Oahu in Honolulu on October 15, 1906. The seventh of 11 children, Fong helped to support his family at an early age

by earning money selling newspapers, shining shoes and caddying on golf courses. After graduating from high school, he went on to attend the University of Hawaii and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa as a graduate in 1930. He then graduated from Harvard Law School and began a career of public service that spanned over 40 years. He served in the Territorial House for 14 years, including 6 as Speaker of the House.

With the coming of statehood in 1959, he ran for a seat in the United States Senate and was elected to three consecutive terms until his retirement in 1976. While serving in office, he was highly regarded for his work on immigration and naturalization law, and for encouraging relations with the People's Republic of China and other developing nations of Asia. From providing timely answers to constituent concerns, to being widely respected by both sides of the aisle, Senator Fong was indeed a great leader.

I ask all Members to honor his leadership by passing S. 2089.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the author of this legislation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amplify my formal statement with a few personal observations. The chairman has kindly indicated some of the history of Senator Fong. It is interesting when I look down and see the word Hiram L. Fong, because he is so much of the history of Hawaii, we all think of him as Senator Fong.

As has been noted, he was the seventh of 11 children of an immigrant family. If there was ever a story of Hawaii, of our rainbow people and our aloha spirit, it is Hiram Fong. He worked a lot of jobs and worked his way through school and did very, very well. He founded not only a prominent law firm but founded as well what became a financial empire.

I have some real interest in it because the very first campaign that I ever ran was funded by Senator Fong's Finance Factors. I went down to get a loan. I thought if I was going to run against him, I thought the least I could do, in the spirit of bipartisanship, was to ask him to help fund my campaign. As a graduate student at the University of Hawaii, I went down to borrow \$50. They said we cannot lend you \$50, we have to lend you \$200 if we are going to make any money on this. So I said, I will take it. I was able to run my very first campaign on Hiram Fong's dime, although I should say nickel, because that is what I passed out in the streets of Honolulu to represent the inflation that I thought we were going to have to deal with in those days. That was an innocent time.

Senator Fong was always gracious. Senator Fong was always able to reach out. As has been noted, he was elected

as a Republican in a very Democratic State. He was supported in great measure and elected in great measure with the support of labor in Hawaii. Most particularly, the ILWU, the International Longshoremen Workers Union, testifying in favor of the establishment of a commission in 2005, after he passed away, to honor and recognize him as a political, business and community leader testified, "The Senator was a successful businessman and a Republican who never forgot his humble beginnings. He was a strong supporter of civil rights and often crossed the aisle to cooperate on issues important to Hawaii's unions and workers."

Senator Hiram Fong came to the United States Senate with the arrival of Hawaii as the last State of the Union. Probably nothing could be more fitting than to recognize him today through this legislation and the pioneer effort that he made. Yes, the last State to enter the Union had as its first Senator the son of an immigrant family who came from China looking for opportunity, looking for justice, and found it in the person of their son, and a true son of Hawaii, Hiram Fong.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2089, a bill to designate a post office in Honolulu, Hawaii, after Senator Hiram L. Fong. This is a fitting tribute for a man who was a great statesman, businessman and community leader.

Senator Fong was born on October 15, 1906, in Kalihi. He was the seventh of 11 children in an immigrant family. A firm believer of standing on his own feet, he worked numerous odd jobs while in public school in order to help support his family. He worked his way through the University of Hawaii where he graduated with honors in 1930. He went on to Harvard Law School and became the state and county Deputy Attorney General of Honolulu for three years.

At the age of 31, Senator Fong began his public service career by serving in Hawaii's Territorial House of Representatives. His ability to work well with both Democrats and Republicans was quickly identified and he was elected Speaker of the House during his first term in office. In 1959, he was elected to the first of three consecutive terms in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Fong never forgot his humble beginnings and was an ardent supporter of labor rights. Despite being a Republican, Senator Fong enjoyed widespread support from the labor unions, particularly the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) which endorsed Senator Fong's candidacy to Congress and campaigned for his reelection.

Senator Fong played an integral role in Hawaii becoming the 50th state and worked on many landmark laws such as the authorization of the Interstate Highway System and the establishment of the East-West Center.

Senator Fong's work and leadership will impact generations to come and it is with great honor that I rise to support S. 2089 in recognition of his leadership and service to this country. I ask my colleagues to support this measure and appreciate the House's attention to the life and work of this great man.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in consideration of S. 2089, legislation naming the postal facility in Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, after Hiram L. Fong. This measure, sponsored by Senator DANIEL AKAKA and cosponsored by Senator DANIEL INOUE, was unanimously passed by the Senate on March 3, 2006. An identical measure, H.R. 4509, sponsored by Mr. ABERCROMBIE, was unanimously reported by our committee on February 1, 2006.

Hiram L. Fong, a native of Hawaii, was a noted and well-known member of Hawaii politics. Mr. Fong was a graduate of the University of Hawaii and Harvard Law School before practicing law in Honolulu. He later served as deputy attorney for the city and county of Honolulu, and during World War II, Mr. Fong served as a major and judge advocate of the 7th Fighter Command of the 7th Air Force from 1942 to 1945.

He began his political career in 1938 as a member of the Territorial legislature, serving 4 years as Vice Speaker and 6 years as Speaker and Vice President of the Territorial Constitutional Convention in 1950. In 1959, Mr. Fong was elected as a Republican to the United States Senate. Upon the admission of Hawaii as a State, he was re-elected in 1964 and again in 1970.

Senator Fong did not seek reelection in 1976. Instead, he returned to private enterprise, serving as chairman of Finance Enterprises, Limited. Sadly, he passed away on August 18, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, as Senator AKAKA, my good friend and colleague observed last week upon the Senate passage of S. 2089, "Senator Hiram Fong was a man of great integrity and a compassionate advocate for civil rights and workers' rights. It is fitting that a United States Post Office near his home in Kalihi be named in his honor. During his 20 years of service in the United States Senate, Senator Fong personified a spirit of bipartisan cooperation. He was instrumental in enacting landmark civil rights legislation in the 1960s; reforming U.S. immigration laws to end discrimination against Asian immigrants; improving job training programs for workers; and fighting for equal pay for women. The people of Hawaii were truly fortunate to have been represented by Hiram Fong."

I commend my colleagues for seeking to honor the political legacy of Senator Hiram Leong Fong and urge swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of S. 2089, legislation which provides permanent recognition—the naming of the prominent Kapalama post office in Honolulu, Hawaii—of the late, great U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii, whose long life—he died in August 2004 at the age of 97—was dedicated to reshaping, for the betterment of all, the social and political landscape of twentieth-century Hawaii.

S. 2089, introduced by Senator DANIEL AKAKA, and cosponsored by Senator DANIEL INOUE, passed the Senate on March 3. I was pleased to reintroduce its companion, H.R. 4509, with Congressman NEIL ABERCROMBIE on December 13, 2005.

Born into poverty in Honolulu in October 1907, Hiram L. Fong was the seventh of 11 children of Chinese-immigrant parents. His father, Fong Sau Howe, originally from China's Kwangtung Province, arrived in Hawaii in 1872, one of 45,000 Chinese immigrants who came to Hawaii to work on the plantations of the islands' once dominant sugar industry. His mother, Fong Lum Shee, arrived in Hawaii when she was 10 years old to work as a maid.

By all accounts, Hiram Fong was enterprising, even as a child. He shined shoes, delivered poi, sold newspapers, led visitors to local tourist spots as well as caddied nine holes of golf for 25 cents.

He attended Hawaii's public schools and was a member of McKinley High School's famous class of 1924, whose 216 members, many of them first-generation immigrants, became some of Hawaii's most distinguished lawyers, business executives, and public servants. Hiram Fong himself became the first resident of Hawaii to receive the Horatio Alger Award for overcoming poverty to achieve great success in law, business, and public service.

As a student at the University of Hawaii, Fong found time to edit the student paper and the yearbook, become a member of the volleyball, rifle and debate teams, and serve as president of the YMCA and Chinese Students Alliance, all the while working at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard as a supply clerk. He somehow managed to graduate from the University of Hawaii with honors in 1930 after just 3 years.

After working at what was then the Suburban Water System of Oahu from 1930 to 1932, Hiram Fong attended Harvard Law School. Upon graduation in 1935, he returned to Honolulu to work as a deputy city attorney.

In 1938, when he was 31, he founded the law firm of Fong, Miho, Choy and Robinson, and entered and won a race for a seat in the Territorial House of Representatives. A member of the Republican Party, he forged a coalition of independent Republicans and Democrats to win election as speaker of the Territorial House, where he would serve a total of 14 years, including three terms as speaker.

Hiram Fong's political career was interrupted by World War II, when he was called to active duty with the Army Air Corps. He served as judge advocate with the 7th Fighter Command of the Seventh Air Force. He later retired as a colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

As a member of the Hawaii Territorial House, Fong supported legislation designed to help organized labor and working families. In 1945, he supported what became known as the "Little Wagner Act," which allowed agriculture workers to unionize. It was Hiram Fong's understanding of and identification with Hawaii's laborers and plantation workers and fellow immigrant families that enabled him, a Republican in an increasingly Democratic Party-dominated Hawaii, to continue winning elections.

His one electoral defeat, which ended the first phase of his political career, came in 1954, when he lost his race for re-election to the Territorial House seat by a mere 31 votes.

Hiram Fong then focused on real estate, insurance, and investments, and established a number of successful island firms: Finance Factors, Finance Realty, Finance Home Builders, and Finance Investment, to name a few.

In the Statehood year of 1959, Fong embarked on the second phase of his political career by running for and winning one of the two new United States Senate seats created for the newly established State of Hawaii. He won re-election in 1964 and 1970, and served with honor and distinction, beloved by all in his native Hawaii and beyond, until his retirement on January 2, 1977. At his retirement, Senator Fong was the ranking Republican on the Senate Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

But even then, Senator Fong, as he was universally known thereafter with great affection, returned home to his various business enterprises and to the devotion of his expanded family. Well into his nineties, he was a remarkable sight as he strode through downtown Honolulu on his way to and from work, excited by what the day brought and eager to continue his long string of accomplishments. At his death, his body lay in state in Hawaii's State Capitol as whole generations of citizens paid tribute to a remarkable man who led a remarkable life.

It is both fitting and appropriate that we provide this modest memorial, as he would have wished, in order to remember the essence of public service and a life well lived by Hawaii's quintessential native son, Hiram L. Fong.

I would like to thank our House Leadership, Congressman TOM DAVIS, chairman of the House Government Reform Committee, and Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, the committee's ranking member, for their assistance in moving this bill expeditiously to the House floor. I also appreciate the support of my colleagues on this measure.

I am certain that Senator Fong's family and friends, and all of Hawaii, are appreciative of all of your support. Mahalo.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of S. 2089, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2089.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DANA REEVE

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dana Reeve who passed away last night following a battle with lung cancer.

I am deeply saddened by the loss of my dear friend, and would like to take a moment to reflect on her life. She

faced extraordinary challenges and handled them with the utmost grace, dignity and strength.

When her husband, Chris, was first injured, Dana helped establish the Christopher Reeve Foundation. Recognizing a lack of any place to go for comprehensive information for newly injured patients and their families, she worked tirelessly to establish the Christopher and Dana Reeve Paralysis Resource Center. Since the launch of this center in 2002, it has assisted thousands of spinal cord injured patients and their loved ones in dealing with the many issues and anxieties that come along with such an injury. Dana used her personal experience to improve the quality of life for all people living with paralysis.

This was typical of Dana, to see beyond her own circumstances and find a way to ease the suffering and confusion of others. After her husband's passing, she moved forward with his message of hope and healing. Today, it is up to all of us to continue their legacy. As Chris and Dana would say, let us go forward.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Dana Reeve's family, friends and all those who mourn her. May God bless her.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2271) to clarify that individuals who receive FISA orders can challenge nondisclosure requirements, that individuals who receive national security letters are not required to disclose the name of their attorney, that libraries are not wire or electronic communication service providers unless they provide specific services, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2271

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term "applicable Act" means the Act entitled "An Act to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes." (109th Congress, 2d Session).

SEC. 3. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FISA ORDERS.

Subsection (f) of section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(f)(1) In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'production order' means an order to produce any tangible thing under this section; and

"(B) the term 'nondisclosure order' means an order imposed under subsection (d).

"(2)(A)(i) A person receiving a production order may challenge the legality of that order by filing a petition with the pool established by section 103(e)(1). Not less than 1 year after the date of the issuance of the pro-

duction order, the recipient of a production order may challenge the nondisclosure order imposed in connection with such production order by filing a petition to modify or set aside such nondisclosure order, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C), with the pool established by section 103(e)(1).

"(ii) The presiding judge shall immediately assign a petition under clause (i) to 1 of the judges serving in the pool established by section 103(e)(1). Not later than 72 hours after the assignment of such petition, the assigned judge shall conduct an initial review of the petition. If the assigned judge determines that the petition is frivolous, the assigned judge shall immediately deny the petition and affirm the production order or nondisclosure order. If the assigned judge determines the petition is not frivolous, the assigned judge shall promptly consider the petition in accordance with the procedures established under section 103(e)(2).

"(iii) The assigned judge shall promptly provide a written statement for the record of the reasons for any determination under this subsection. Upon the request of the Government, any order setting aside a nondisclosure order shall be stayed pending review pursuant to paragraph (3).

"(B) A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a production order may grant such petition only if the judge finds that such order does not meet the requirements of this section or is otherwise unlawful. If the judge does not modify or set aside the production order, the judge shall immediately affirm such order, and order the recipient to comply therewith.

"(C)(i) A judge considering a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order may grant such petition only if the judge finds that there is no reason to believe that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States, interfere with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation, interfere with diplomatic relations, or endanger the life or physical safety of any person.

"(ii) If, upon filing of such a petition, the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation certifies that disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States or interfere with diplomatic relations, such certification shall be treated as conclusive, unless the judge finds that the certification was made in bad faith.

"(iii) If the judge denies a petition to modify or set aside a nondisclosure order, the recipient of such order shall be precluded for a period of 1 year from filing another such petition with respect to such nondisclosure order.

"(D) Any production or nondisclosure order not explicitly modified or set aside consistent with this subsection shall remain in full effect.

"(3) A petition for review of a decision under paragraph (2) to affirm, modify, or set aside an order by the Government or any person receiving such order shall be made to the court of review established under section 103(b), which shall have jurisdiction to consider such petitions. The court of review shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for its decision and, on petition by the Government or any person receiving such order for writ of certiorari, the record shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

"(4) Judicial proceedings under this subsection shall be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The record of proceedings, including petitions filed, orders granted, and statements of reasons for decision, shall be

maintained under security measures established by the Chief Justice of the United States, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

“(5) All petitions under this subsection shall be filed under seal. In any proceedings under this subsection, the court shall, upon request of the Government, review *ex parte* and in camera any Government submission, or portions thereof, which may include classified information.”.

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURES.

(a) FISA.—Subparagraph (C) of section 501(d)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)(2)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(C) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (1) shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request.”.

(b) TITLE 18.—Paragraph (4) of section 2709(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request under subsection (a).”.

(c) FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 626(d) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(d)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for the identity of financial institutions or a consumer report respecting any consumer under this section.”.

(2) OTHER AGENCIES.—Paragraph (4) of section 627(c) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(c)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the authorized government agency, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized government agency the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for information under subsection (a).”.

(d) RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 1114(a)(3) of the Right to Financial Pri-

vacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(3)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(D) At the request of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the authorized Government authority or the Secret Service of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for financial records under this subsection.”.

(2) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Clause (iv) of section 1114(a)(5)(D) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(D)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(iv) At the request of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the Director or such designee the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the Director or such designee of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request for financial records under subparagraph (A).”.

(e) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Paragraph (4) of section 802(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436(b)), as amended by the applicable Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) At the request of the authorized investigative agency, any person making or intending to make a disclosure under this section shall identify to the requesting official of the authorized investigative agency the person to whom such disclosure will be made or to whom such disclosure was made prior to the request, except that nothing in this section shall require a person to inform the requesting official of the identity of an attorney to whom disclosure was made or will be made to obtain legal advice or legal assistance with respect to the request under subsection (a).”.

SEC. 5. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR LIBRARY PATRONS.

Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by the applicable Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LIBRARIES.—A library (as that term is defined in section 213(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122(1)), the services of which include access to the Internet, books, journals, magazines, newspapers, or other similar forms of communication in print or digitally by patrons for their use, review, examination, or circulation, is not a wire or electronic communication service provider for purposes of this section, unless the library is providing the services defined in section 2510(15) (‘electronic communication service’) of this title.”.

This Act shall become effective immediately upon enactment.

□ 1445

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2271 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. On December 14 of last year, the House passed the conference report on H.R. 3199, the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, by a strong bipartisan vote of 251-174. Last Thursday, the other body followed the bipartisan lead of this House and approved the conference report by an overwhelming vote of 89-10.

When the House Judiciary Committee unanimously reported the PATRIOT Act a month after the 9/11 attacks, I pledged to vigorously examine its implementation to ensure that enhanced law enforcement authority is required to reduce America's vulnerability that terrorism did not erode our constitutional or civil liberties.

As the historical record makes amply clear, it was the House, led by former majority leader Dick Armey and me, that forcefully insisted that much of the PATRIOT Act's expansion of law enforcement authority sunset without affirmative congressional reauthorization.

These sunsets helped complement aggressive Congressional oversight of the implementation of the PATRIOT Act. The conference report now passed by both houses represents the product of comprehensive bipartisan consideration consisting of legislative and oversight hearings, briefings, and inspector general reports and committee correspondence. This extensive record, a chronology of which I will submit for the RECORD, has demonstrated that the PATRIOT Act has been an effective tool against terrorists and other criminals.

At the same time, intense congressional and public scrutiny has not produced a single substantiated claim that the PATRIOT Act has been misused to violate American civil liberties. However, the conference report contained over 30 important civil liberties amendments and revisions revised to further mitigate the potential for misuse of the PATRIOT Act.

This bill includes three additional clarifications of the conference report to address concerns raised by some Members of the other body.

First, current law does not expressly provide a recipient of a section 215 order or a national security letter the

right to challenge it. The conference report clearly delineated judicial review for such challenges, including the ability of NSL recipients to challenge an accompanying nondisclosure order. S. 2271 would extend the section 215 recipients similar access to judicial review, to challenge and attach the nondisclosure order.

Second, because of national security concerns, the conference report contained language that would allow the government to ask a recipient of one of these national security orders to identify the persons to whom disclosure will be or was made. The Director of National Intelligence expressed concern that without this safeguard, a recipient could disclose the government's investigative efforts to a person with ties to hostile foreign governments or entities.

The conference report permitted the government to determine whether a request is warranted, and if the defendant has made such a request to determine whether the disclosure affected an ongoing investigation. An exception was included for information that might interfere with attorney-client relations, specifically barring the disclosure of the identity of an attorney to whom a recipient planned to disclose. This bill extends the exception to prevent the government from requesting the name of counsels with whom the recipient had already consulted.

Finally, S. 2271 clarifies current law that a library may only be subject to an NSL request if it falls under 18 U.S.C. 2516(15), which defines an electronic communications service provider as any service which provides to users thereof the ability to send or receive wire or electronic communication. This change addresses the potential for misuse alleged by critics of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 5 years, the PATRIOT Act has been the focus of virtually unprecedented congressional and public scrutiny. Opponents of this legislation have relied upon exaggeration and hyperbole to distort a demonstrated record of accomplishment and success.

The Justice Department and other agencies have properly used the PATRIOT Act to detect, disrupt and dismantle sales in New York, Virginia and Oregon before they struck. The PATRIOT Act helped tear down the pre-9/11 wall that prevented law enforcement intelligence agencies from sharing critical information necessary to avert terrorist attacks on American soil.

It has become a critical tool of America's law enforcement arsenal and a vital deterrent against terrorist subversion. It upheld our constitutional values, and none of the provisions authorized by the conference report have been held unconstitutional.

Simply stated, the PATRIOT Act has made America safer while safeguarding our civil liberties. The conference report contained provisions to address

claims that the PATRIOT Act might be misused to violate civil liberties, and Senate 2271 contains additional provisions to further allay these concerns. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and look forward to the eminent enactment of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 into law.

The following material is a chronology of the oversight of the PATRIOT Act from October of 2001 to November of 2005 and a listing of additional civil liberties protections contained in the conference report of H.R. 3119:

OVERSIGHT OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT FROM OCTOBER, 2001, TO NOVEMBER, 2005

1. November 9, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary staff on press accounts of FBI use of NSLs;

2. October 25, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary and Committees on Intelligence staff on press accounts of FBI use of NSLs;

3. October 6, 2005, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on press accounts of mistakes in FBI applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under the USA PATRIOT Act;

4. July 12, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to July 1, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

5. July 12, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to May 19, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

6. July 11, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Rep. Bobby Scott responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

7. July 11, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the House Committee on the Judiciary regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

8. July 5, 2005, letter from FBI Director Mueller to Senate Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

9. July 1, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Rep. Bobby Scott responding to questions regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

10. July 1, 2005, letter from House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

11. June 29, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary responding to April 5, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

12. June 10, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act;

13. June 8, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act;

14. May 26, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Material Witness Provisions of the Criminal Code and the Implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act; Section 505 that Addresses National Security Letters; and Section 804 that Addresses Jurisdiction over Crimes Committed at U.S. Facilities Abroad;

15. May 19, 2005, letter from House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

16. May 10, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on the prohibition of Material Support to Terrorists and Foreign Terrorist Organizations and on the DOJ Inspector General's Reports on Civil Liberty Violations under the USA PATRIOT Act;

17. May 10, 2005, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on continued oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act;

18. May 5, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act that Allows Emergency Disclosure of Electronic Communications to Protect Life and Limb;

19. May 3, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Sections 201, 202, 213, and 223 of the USA PATRIOT Act and Their Effect on Law Enforcement Surveillance;

20. April 28, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Section 218 of the USA PATRIOT Act—If It Expires Will the "Wall" Return?;

21. April 28, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Have Sections 206 and 215 Improved Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Investigations?;

22. April 26, 2005, letter from Assistant Attorney General William Moschella to Senator Dianne Feinstein responding to April 4, 2005, letter regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

23. April 26, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing: Have Sections 204, 207, 214, and 225 of the USA PATRIOT Act, and Sections 6001 and 6002 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, improved FISA Investigations;

24. April 21, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Crime, Terrorism, and the Age of Technology—(Section 209: Seizure of Voice-Mail Messages Pursuant to Warrants; Section 217: Interception of Computer Trespasser Communications; and Section 220: Nationwide Service of Search Warrants for Electronic Evidence);

25. April 20, 2005, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing: A Review of the Material Support to Terrorism Prohibition;

26. April 19, 2005, House Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security hearing on Sections 203(b) and (d) of the USA PATRIOT Act and their Effect on Information Sharing;

27. April 6, 2005, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing with Attorney General Gonzales;

28. April 5, 2005, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Oversight of the USA PATRIOT Act;

29. March 22, 2005, Department of Justice law enforcement sensitive briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

30. September 22, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing: A Review of Counter-Terrorism Legislation and Proposals, Including the USA PATRIOT Act and the SAFE Act May 5, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing: Aiding Terrorists—A Review of the Material Support Statute;

31. May 20, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on FBI Oversight: Terrorism;

32. April 14, 2004, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Preventing and Responding to Acts of Terrorism: A Review of Current Law;

33. February 3, 2004, Department of Justice briefing for House Committee on the Judiciary staff on its views of S. 1709, the "Security and Freedom Ensured (SAFE) Act of

2003," and H.R. 3352, the House companion bill, as both bills proposed changes to the USA PATRIOT Act;

34. November 20, 2003, request by Chairmen Sensenbrenner and Hostettler to GAO requesting a study of the implementation of the USA PATRIOT Act anti-money laundering provisions. Report was released on June 6, 2005;

35. October 29, 2003, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

36. September 10, 2003, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing on Terrorism: Two Years After 9/11, Connecting the Dots;

37. August 7, 2003, Department of Justice briefing for House Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff regarding the long-standing authority for law enforcement to conduct delayed searches and collect business records and the effect of the USA PATRIOT Act on those authorities;

38. July 23, 2003, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on Law Enforcement and Terrorism;

39. June 13, 2003, letter from Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs at the Department of Homeland Security, Pamela J. Turner, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

40. June 10, 2003, Department of Justice classified briefing for Committee on the Judiciary Members and staff on the use of FISA under the USA PATRIOT Act;

41. June 5, 2003, House Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the U.S. Department of Justice, including its use of the provisions authorized by the USA PATRIOT Act;

42. May 20, 2003, House Subcommittee on the Constitution hearing: Anti-Terrorism Investigations and the Fourth Amendment After September 11th: Where and When Can Government Go to Prevent Terrorist Attacks;

43. May 13, 2003, letter from Acting Assistant Attorney General, Jamie Brown to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

44. April 1, 2003, letter from the House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

45. October 9, 2002, Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology, and Homeland Security hearing: Tools Against Terror: How the Administration is Implementing New Laws in the Fight to Protect our Homeland;

46. September 20, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

47. September 10, 2002, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the USA PATRIOT Act in Practice: Shedding Light on the FISA Process;

48. August 26, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant, to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

49. July 26, 2002, letter from Assistant Attorney General, Daniel Bryant to the House Committee on the Judiciary responding to questions regarding the USA PATRIOT Act;

50. July 25, 2002, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on the Department of Justice, including its implementation of the authorities granted by the USA PATRIOT Act;

51. June 13, 2002, letter from the House Committee on the Judiciary to the Attorney General regarding use of the USA PATRIOT Act;

52. April 17, 2002, Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts

hearing: "Should the Office of Homeland Security Have More Power? A Case Study in Information Sharing;"

53. December 6, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism;

54. December 4, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism;

55. November 28, 2001, Senate Committee on the Judiciary hearing on DOJ Oversight: Preserving our Freedoms While Defending Against Terrorism; and

56. October 3, 2001, Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Property Rights hearing: Protecting Constitutional Freedoms in the Face of Terrorism.

ADDITIONAL CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS CONTAINED IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3199, THE USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005

The conference report contains the following additional safeguards:

Requires a description of a specific target in both the application and the court order for "roving wiretaps," and specific facts in the application that show that the target's actions may thwart surveillance efforts—if the target's true identity is unknown.

Requires that the FBI must notify the court within 10 days after beginning surveillance of any new phone for all "roving wiretaps." The notice must include the total number of electronic surveillances conducted under the court's multipoint order.

Includes new reporting requirements to Congress, including new details about the use of "roving" authority.

Requires that for delayed notice search warrants that notice of the search be given within 30 days of its execution, unless the facts justify a later date, eliminating the open-ended period of delay permissible under current law.

Allows for extensions of the delay period in giving notice of a search, but only upon an updated showing of the need for further delay. Also, it limits any extension to 90 days or less, unless the facts of the case justify a longer delay.

Adds new reporting requirements to Congress on the use of delayed notice search warrants.

Requires for section 215 orders, relating to investigator's access to business records, a statement of facts showing reasonable grounds to believe that the records or other things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism or espionage. This provides additional safeguards to the original USA PATRIOT Act, which required the government only to certify that the records at issue were sought for an authorized investigation—without any factual showing.

Requires a three part test for section 215 orders that ensures the records are sought for: a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power; the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of an authorized investigation; or an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of an authorized investigation. This test combined with the newly required statement of facts should mitigate concerns of government "fishing expeditions," while maintaining the flexibility for legitimate terrorism investigations.

Explicitly guarantees the right for recipients of section 215 orders to consult legal counsel and seek judicial review.

Requires high level approval by either the FBI Director, Deputy Director, or Executive Assistant Director for requests for certain

records, including library records, medical records, educational records, and tax return records.

Limits the scope of section 215 orders to materials that could be obtained via grand jury subpoena or a similar court order for the production of records.

Limits retention, and prohibits dissemination, of information concerning U.S. persons.

Requires that the DOJ Inspector General conduct two separate audits of the FBI's use of section 215 orders that will examine: any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to 215 orders, including any improper or illegal use of the authority; the manner in which such information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the FBI; and an assessment of whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

Requires enhanced reporting to Congress of section 215 orders, including a breakdown of its use to obtain library records, medical records, educational records, and other sensitive types of records.

Requires public reporting of the aggregate use of section 215 orders.

Allows recipients of National Security Letters (NSLs) to consult with legal counsel.

Creates an explicit right to judicial review of NSL requests.

Permits a reviewing court to modify or set aside an NSL if compliance would be unreasonable, oppressive, or otherwise unlawful—this is the same standard used to modify or quash a subpoena in a criminal case.

Provides for judicial review of the non-disclosure requirements.

Adds a "knowing and willfully" standard that must be proven before someone who discloses an NSL can be subject to a 1-year misdemeanor offense.

Requires the DOJ IG to conduct two comprehensive audits of the FBI's use of NSLs.

Requires the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of applying minimization procedures to NSLs to ensure the protection of constitutional rights of U.S. persons.

Adds a new "sunshine" provision that requires annual public reporting on NSLs.

Provides for expanded congressional access to significant FISA reporting currently provided to the Intelligence Committees.

Includes a provision requiring the FISA Court to submit its rules & procedures to Congress.

Creates new reporting requirements for the use of emergency authorities under FISA.

Requires new reporting on the use of emergency disclosures of communications information made under section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

Requires the Department of Justice to submit a report to Congress on the Department's data-mining activities.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me just begin by pointing out that in the dissent from the bill reported, there are six precise examples of when the PATRIOT Act has been abused so that no one will be able to say that they don't know where they are. They are on page 2 and 3 of the dissents that have been filed with the committee.

What we have, we have passed the conference report already. It was passed on December 14, 2005. Because of the other body, and the serious objections that they have raised, we are getting now to three other points that are

being raised. Two of the points are the basis of my remarks this afternoon.

The first I would like you to know about in S. 2271 is that amazingly enough, after all the debate, this measure that we are considering today makes section 215 intelligence orders for any tangible thing harder to challenge in court than the current conference report which allows a recipient to challenge the gag order immediately. This measure before us that we will be voting on would make the recipient wait a year, but then to make it really worse, rather than the reviewing court immediately allowing the gag order, allowing the gag as the government's *carte blanche* assertion of national security is conclusive.

We have added two things. We make the assertion of national security conclusive, plus we make the person that challenges it not able to immediately go to court. This is a setback.

The second thing that we do is that we add no meaningful protection for library records. That is to say that the present conference reports allow immediate challenge. What we do is that according to the National Association of Library Records, we make the protection for library records exempt only if, the national security letters, they don't offer Internet access. But the American Library Association puts the number of libraries without Internet access at nearly zero.

What we have done is create a fig leaf that really does nothing to give the meaningful protection that the library association has requested and that we tried to get through in our legislation. So it is with great reluctance that even on two out of the three measures that are before us in this very small bill, we find that this is unsupportable.

In addition, finally, what this measure doesn't do is address any of the core problems with the PATRIOT Act, the main one being that we have asked for moderate changes that would have ensured that these extraordinary new powers are directed solely at terrorists or to those associated with terrorists, and this measure fails to do that. For those reasons, I am unable to support this measure and urge that it be defeated.

There is no more difficult task we have as legislators than balancing our Nation's need for security against our citizens' civil liberties. Nearly five years after the tragedy of September 11, and in the midst of a war against terror without any clear endpoint, it is increasingly clear that we are failing in that task.

We failed when we rushed through the first PATRIOT Act while the wreck of the World Trade Center was still smoldering. We failed when we refused to address the repeated civil liberties abuses by our own government, including the warrantless surveillance of U.S. citizens. And today, we are failing yet again, by taking up S. 2771. Not only is the bill substantively dangerous, it does nothing to respond to the serious flaws in the conference report.

First, the bill is dangerous because it makes it practically impossible to challenge the gag

orders that come with secretive 215 orders. It would not only make the recipient wait at least one full year before challenging a gag order, it deems government certifications concerning possible harm to national security to be "conclusive." This is far worse than what is proposed by the conference report which would allow the FISA court to ensure that the law and the Constitution are not violated.

Second, the bill operates as a mere fig leaf, covering over serious problems in the underlying conference report. For example, the bill pretends to protect libraries from receiving National Security Letters, but then revokes that protection if the library offers internet access. The bill does nothing to prevent the government from using security letters to obtain confidential information having nothing to do with terrorism; nothing to protect secret physical searches of homes and offices; and nothing to rein in abusive roving wiretap orders.

If we are serious about combating terror in the 21st century, we must move beyond symbolic gestures and color coded threat levels, and begin to make the hard choices needed to protect our Nation. If we really want to prevent terrorists from targeting our citizens and our cities, we need keep assault weapons out of the hands of suspected terrorists. And if we really want to protect our people and secure our ports and other transportation hubs, the administration needs to honor the letter and the spirit of our security laws and fully fund our homeland security needs.

The legislation before us today endangers our civil liberties, while doing nothing meaningful to protect our citizens. I urge a no vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), chair of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, pardon my immodesty. I believe that this bill has been thoroughly and consistently examined, but I don't think there has been a committee other than the House Judiciary Committee, I don't think there has been a subcommittee, other than the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, that has worked any more diligently than have we.

Now, the chairman used the words vulnerable and vulnerability in his opening statement. We are indeed, we were on 9/11, we are today. But as the chairman furthermore pointed out, much misleading and inaccurate information has been associated and directed to the PATRIOT Act. I used this example on the floor earlier, Mr. Speaker. A constituent of mine came to me all upset, concerned about the PATRIOT Act.

We must get rid of the PATRIOT Act, he said to me. I said to him, give me an example how it has adversely affected you. He said, I can't do it. I said, give me an example of how it has adversely affected anyone you know. I can't do it, he replied. I further said, give me an example where any third party has been adversely affected. Again he came up short.

This is the misleading information that has convinced many people across our land that it is no good. In this era of instant and universal communications, if a piece of legislation is as bad as my constituents thought it was, surely he would have some evidence as to some information to indicate to me why the bill is so onerous.

□ 1500

Granted, the bill expanded the parameters of law enforcement, but not to the detriment of law-abiding citizens.

After 9/11, I made the statement that my most pressing fear is that the next attack will come by water at ports and/or harbors, the very issue that plagues us today with the ports issue. We are indeed still vulnerable, but we are not as vulnerable as we were on 9/11, and part of that security must be directly related to the PATRIOT Act. We are not invincible, by any means; but we are more secure, we are more protected than we were then, because I think we now fully appreciate the enemy, the terrorism that hangs heavy over our heads; and I think the PATRIOT Act, Madam Speaker, will serve a good purpose to that end.

I again thank the chairman for having yielded time to me, and I thank him for his leadership as we have pursued this effort in the past several months.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I want to say to my good friend and my respected chair and the Member who just spoke that one of the things you have to keep in mind is the information that they are saying hasn't been brought forward to the public wouldn't be brought forward to the public under what has been essentially a secret manner of investigation.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation because it offers only superficial reform that would have little, if any, impact on safeguarding our civil liberties. Furthermore, it has become crystal clear that this administration is currently and will continue to abuse, attack, and outright deny the civil liberties of the people of this country in defiance of our Constitution. This administration is illegally wiretapping American citizens, illegally collecting information on peace groups, and illegally signing statements to ignore the torture ban recently enacted by this Congress.

Some of my colleagues will stand up here today and argue the PATRIOT Act had nothing to do with these nefarious activities, but my colleagues are not looking at the big picture. The administration is violating the laws Congress has passed and trampling on the Constitution of the United States.

I will not give this administration any additional police powers. Congress has failed to do its job as a coequal branch of government. The administration's attack on our democracy has to

be reined in. This Congress must not walk away from its role in providing a check and balance to the administration's exercise of executive power.

This Congress was not zealous in oversight prior to 2001; but since that time, this Congress has ignored its constitutional duty, and 200 years of American democracy have suffered. The complacency of this Congress is clearly viewed by the administration as a license to ignore the laws it disagrees with, and then it demands Congress pass expanded police powers.

In the name of the Constitution of the United States of America, I reject this complacency. I will not vote to give a single new police power to this administration. I voted against the PATRIOT Act when it first passed, and I remain even more opposed to this legislation today.

The bill before us today enables the FBI to investigate any American for any reason without the checks and balances of the judicial system. History tells us that unchecked police powers with little or no oversight will be abused and the citizens will be harmed. The administration's record in this area is concrete proof that history repeats itself.

I am for police function that protects citizens of this great Nation, not a police function that is used to terrorize them. I urge my colleagues to vote against the PATRIOT Act reauthorization, to stand up for our Constitution, to stand up for our Bill of Rights, to remember the long struggle that was instrumental in establishing those liberties.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the statement we just heard is at variance with what has happened since the PATRIOT Act was enacted.

First, none of the 16 provisions that expanded law enforcement powers has been held unconstitutional by any Federal Court in the country in over 4 years of being tested. Second, the PATRIOT Act requires the Justice Department Inspector General to report to Congress twice a year on civil liberties violations that have been investigated. We have gotten those reports. There haven't been any. Third, there is a provision in the PATRIOT Act that said anybody who thinks their civil liberties are violated can sue the Justice Department and get \$10,000 of statutory damages in addition to proven economic damages and attorneys fees. So far, not a dime has been paid out in judgments or settlements under this section.

This is an example of how the PATRIOT Act has been distorted by those who are opposed to it. Let us talk about the PATRIOT Act, because the PATRIOT Act has passed muster, and the facts and the court decisions show it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, after 9/11, one of the most responsible things that this Congress did was to pass the PATRIOT Act. It tore down that wall that existed between the intelligence community and the law enforcement community, a wall that was specifically talked about in the 9/11 Commission report as one of the failures of our government to prepare for the threats that we had prior to 9/11. What we are doing now is reaffirming that responsible act by this Congress. This today is the final critical piece of the USA PATRIOT Act, reflecting the careful balancing of national security and the civil liberties of our citizens.

In total, over 30 changes, additional civil liberty protections, have been made to the base legislation. It reflects the reality that security must not be juxtaposed against the notion of rights. It is absolutely true that the first civil right of all Americans is the right not to be murdered, not to be murdered by terrorists.

The three additional changes contained in the bill before us, S. 2271, go beyond the 30 additions that we had in the conference report itself. There are civil liberties protections concerning, first, the ability to challenge the legality of a section 215 order. Section 215 deals with business records, including library records. Secondly, it adds civil liberties protections concerning the protection of the confidentiality of a name of an attorney to whom information has been disclosed. Third, it places limitations concerning the use of national security letters with respect to libraries.

These 30-plus changes to the underlying legislation were made despite the fact that in this last year we had 13 separate hearings on the PATRIOT Act; and in those 13 hearings we found not a single, single, incidence of abuse of the law. We placed the Attorney General of the United States under oath. We placed the number two person at the Justice Department under oath. We heard from supporters of this act; we heard from the detractors of this act. We examined the Inspector General's reports. We had the opportunity to look at classified data that backed up the request for the use of this act.

I personally did that, as well as other members of the subcommittee and the full committee; and we could not find a single example of an established abuse of the statute as written or as applied.

On the basis of the Bali terrorist attacks, the bombing in Spain, the terrible 7/7 incident in London, the threat to the safety and security of our citizens continues. It didn't end with the passage of the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act, as it has been implemented, has allowed us to protect ourselves from future such attacks.

We must not now lapse into a pre-9/11 lethargy. Unlike normal criminal investigations, terrorism presents law

enforcement with the task of preventing a cataclysmic attack. That is why I rise in support of this bill before us.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from Virginia, I yield myself 45 seconds, because this is getting a little bit out of hand.

The assertion has been made that none of the 16 provisions have violated the law, but two Federal District Courts in New York and Connecticut have found that the national security letters themselves are illegal. Two courts, that the national security letters were held to be illegal. And to say that there have been no abuses, read pages 2 and 3 of the dissent of the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee about all of the violations that have gone on.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, the national security letters were not one of the additional law enforcement powers that were passed as a part of the PATRIOT Act. They were passed in 1986, 15 years before 9/11 and the PATRIOT Act was passed.

The gentleman is correct in saying that national security letters were held unconstitutional, and what we did in this reauthorization bill is to provide a procedure to challenge them and make them constitutional, even though they weren't in the original PATRIOT Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, let me just first say I believe it is inappropriate to even discuss the PATRIOT Act until we have had hearings to find out what is going on with the NSA wiretaps. The PATRIOT Act could be, in fact, irrelevant if you are wiretapping at will, as the President has suggested; and we want to know exactly what is going on with those wiretaps before we do anything else. But this bill is on the floor, so we have to discuss that.

Unfortunately, I have to oppose this bill because it still continues to require no finding of individualized suspicion as a trigger to the secret record search powers in sections 215 and 505. That means that innocent Americans can have their sensitive records searched without any showing that they are an agent of a terrorist organization or scheming with terrorist organizations or doing anything illegal. Instead, this continues the problems in the original PATRIOT Act. This bill addresses several of the problems, but doesn't actually solve them.

One thing it helps is the fact that the recipient of a national security letter will be able to consult a lawyer without having to notify the government of the attorney's name. This is merely cosmetic, because that has actually been the recent practice.

In terms of these interstate letters, the bill addresses the right to challenge the gag order which applies to the secret orders under 215, as well as the national security letters; but it says that you can't make the challenge for 1 year. It codifies a 1-year period during which you can't do anything. That makes the present law worse. Presumably, you could go in right away to challenge the NSA and see the secret orders; but now you have to wait a year, and at the end of the year, you can't do anything, because all the government has to do is certify that the gag order needs to stay in effect. The judge has no discretion as to overturning that certification. So although this issue is addressed, it is actually made worse.

Finally, Madam Speaker, there is a question on the protection of privacy of library patrons in terms of the Internet service providers as to whether or not the library is an Internet service provider. The language is a little bit confusing.

Madam Speaker, I would enter into the RECORD a colloquy between the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU, the chief patron of the bill. Assuming that he means what he said he meant on the floor of the Senate, we don't have a problem with it. So I would like to ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD the colloquy between the two Senators as to what section 5 actually means.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, is it in order to introduce into the RECORD in this body debate that has been taken in the other body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent, it may be done.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Further reserving the right to object, let the record be clear that as manager of the bill, I do not necessarily agree with the debate that was taken between the two Senators in the other body.

□ 1515

But if the gentleman from Virginia wishes to insert that in the RECORD for its hortatory nature, I will not object.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, it will be entered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce this. It represents the intent of the chief sponsor of the bill, which we agree with, although I understand the manager of the bill in the House may not.

COLLOQUY BETWEEN SENATORS JOHN SUNUNU AND DICK DURBIN ON SECTION 5 OF S. 2271, FEBRUARY 16, 2006

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at this moment, I wish to address the bill pending before the Senate, and that is S. 2271.

I commend Senator John Sununu of New Hampshire, who is here in the Chamber. Were it not for his hard work, we would not be here today. For weeks, while many of us were doing other things back home, Senator Sununu was working assiduously with the White House to find a way to address some very vexing and challenging issues when it came to modifying the PATRIOT Act. He has done an excellent job. I commend him and tell him that I have enjoyed working with him over the last 2 years, where we have crossed party lines and tried to find ways to keep the PATRIOT Act as a tool to make America safe but also at the same time to protect our basic liberties.

Every step of the way, as we considered changes to the PATRIOT Act, we have been supported by our Nation's librarians. These are wonderful men and women—professionals—who are dedicated to the libraries across America, which are such rich resources. I thank the librarians of America, especially for their heroic efforts to amend the PATRIOT Act in a responsible way and, equally as important, to defend our Constitution.

I understand that section 5 of Senator Sununu's bill, S. 2271, will help protect the privacy of Americans' library records. I ask the indulgence of the Chair that I might enter into a colloquy with Senator Sununu relative to section 5.

I would like to ask Senator Sununu, through the Chair, if he could explain to me what section 5 will accomplish.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor today and pleased to be able to see the light at the end of the tunnel on PATRIOT reauthorization, thanks to the work of Senator Durbin and others. We have legislation before us that will make the adjustments to the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report mentioned by the Senator from Illinois. He specifically mentioned section 5 of our legislation. As he began to describe, section 5 is intended to clarify current law regarding the applicability of National Security Letters to libraries.

A National Security Letter is a type of administrative subpoena, a powerful tool available to law enforcement officials, to get access to documents. It is a document signed by an FBI agent that requires a business to provide certain kinds of personal records on their customers to the Government. These subpoenas are not approved by a judge before being issued.

What we did in this legislation is add clarifying language that states that libraries operating in their traditional functions: lending books, providing access to digital books or periodicals in digital format, and providing basic access to the Internet would not be subject to a national security letter. There is no National Security Letter statute existing in current law that permits the FBI explicitly to obtain library records. But, as was indicated by the Senator from Illinois, librarians have been concerned that existing National Security Letter authority is vague enough so that it could be used to allow the Government to treat libraries as they do communication service providers such as a telephone company or a traditional Internet service provider from whom consumers would go out and get their access to the Internet and send and receive e-mail.

Section 5 clarifies, as I indicated, that a library providing basic Internet access would not be subject to a national security letter, simply by virtue of making that access available to the public.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. It is my understanding that most public libraries, as he explained, offer Internet access to the public. Because of

this, they are concerned that the Government might consider them to be communications service providers similar to the traditional providers, such as AT&T, Verizon, and AOL.

So if I understand it correctly, your bill clarifies that libraries, simply because they provide basic Internet access, are not communications service providers under the law and are not subject to national security letters as a result. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, through the Chair, is that a correct conclusion?

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I absolutely believe that the conclusion of the Senator from Illinois is correct. A library providing basic Internet access would not be subject to a National Security Letter as a result of that particular service and other services that are very much in keeping with the traditional role of libraries.

Some have noted or may note that basic Internet access gives library patrons the ability to send and receive e-mail by, for example, accessing an Internet-based e-mail service. But in that case, it is the Web site operator who is providing the communication service—the Internet communication service provider itself—and not the library, which is simply making available a computer with access to the Internet.

So I certainly share the concerns of the Senator from Illinois and others who have worked very long and hard on this and other provisions. I think it does add clarity to the law as he described, in addition to providing other improvements to the PATRIOT Act as they relate to civil liberty protections. All along, this has been about providing law enforcement with the tools that they need in their terrorism investigations while, at the same time, balancing those powers with the need to protect civil liberties. I think, in the legislation before us, we have added clarity to the law in giving access to the courts to object to section 215 gag orders and, of course, striking a very punitive provision dealing with counsel and not forcing the recipient of a National Security Letter to disclose the name of their attorney to the FBI.

All of these are improvements to the underlying legislation, and I recognize that we had a overwhelming, bipartisan vote today to move forward on this package. I anticipate that we will have similar bipartisan votes in the days ahead to conclude work on this legislation and get a much improved PATRIOT Act signed into law.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, as well, because that clarification is important. So if a library offers basic Internet access, and within that access a patron can, for example, send and receive e-mail by accessing an Internet-based e-mail service such as Hotmail, for example, that does not mean the library is a communications service provider and, therefore, it does not mean that a library could be subject to these national security letters of investigation.

By way of comparison, a gas station that has a pay phone isn't a telephone company. So a library that has Internet access, where a person can find an Internet e-mail service, is not a communications service provider; therefore, it would not fall under the purview of the NSL provision in 18 U.S.C. 2709. It is a critically important distinction. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for making that clear and for all of his good work on this bill.

Libraries are fundamental to America. They symbolize our access to education. They are available to everyone, regardless of social or economic status.

When we first introduced the SAFE Act, I went to the Chicago Public Library to make the announcement. The library was established in 1873, and for over 130 years it has

given the people of the City of Chicago the ability to read and learn and communicate. Here is what the mission statement says at that public library:

We welcome and support all people and their enjoyment of reading and pursuit of lifelong learning. We believe in the freedom to read, to learn, and to discover.

We have to ensure, in the Senate and in Congress, in the bills that we pass, including the PATRIOT Act, that this freedom to read, learn, and discover is preserved for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the continued effort to reauthorize the United States PATRIOT Act. It is well overdue for this Congress to ensure those trying to protect the American people have all the tools necessary to combat terrorism.

With the passage of this bill, Congress will have demonstrated its overwhelming desire to protect our civil liberties while protecting our homeland. We have taken every precaution to ensure an overzealous government cannot overstep its constitutional responsibility.

Among other provisions, this legislation allows a person receiving a FISA production order to produce any tangible item that they deem necessary to challenge that order before a district court.

This bill also removes libraries from the definition of a wire or electronic service communication provider for purposes of granting the national security letters, unless, unless the library actually provides electronic communication service.

These are commonsense amendments that will continue to fine-tune the balance between our homeland security and our constitutional rights as American citizens. I thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER for yielding me the time and for his outstanding work on this vital issue.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Madam Speaker, just to keep the record straight, in 1986, national security letters were limited to terrorists. The PATRIOT Act lowered the standard to anything relevant to an investigation, and now over 30,000 are issued every year. The sham fix does not help us at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, we are engaged in a serious war with terrorism. But we are going after the wrong targets. We are not protecting ourselves, but we are attacking our liberties. We are not doing anything adequate to secure the loose nuclear materials all over the former Soviet Union before they are smuggled to al Qaeda to make atomic bombs.

We search only 5 percent of the 9 million shipping containers that come into

our country every year, any one of which could contain a weapon of mass destruction.

But what are we doing? Well, the President has orchestrated a secret conspiracy to violate the criminal law by ordering clearly illegal domestic surveillance.

And now we renew the PATRIOT Act with some of the worst provisions only cosmetically changed and continuing to threaten civil liberties. Section 215 allows the government to obtain business reports about people, including library, medical and various other types of business records, as long as they are "sought for a terrorism investigation."

The government simply has to come up with a statement of facts showing there are reasonable grounds to believe that tangible things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation. Relevant? Almost anything can be relevant.

To make matters worse, the recipients of a section 215 order are subject to an almost unreviewable automatic gag order. Now we are told, under this bill, that judicial review can take place after a year. At best. A year? And in order to prevail in challenging a gag order, a certification by the government that disclosure would harm national security or impair diplomatic relations would be conclusive, unless shown it would be in bad faith.

Conclusive? No evidentiary showing, no evidentiary test. That is absurd. That means there is no test at all. Section 505 authorizes FBI field office directors to collect in secret almost limitless sensitive personal information from entities simply by issuing national security letters.

The FBI can simply say they want your private and sensitive information and they can get it. This is very much like the writ of assistance the British used to grant in 1761 that helped start the American Revolution. Under the conference report, recipients would theoretically have the ability to challenge these gag orders, but again that will be virtually impossible.

As with section 215, the government's assertion that the gag order is necessary to protect the national security would be a conclusive presumption that the government is telling the truth that the gag order could stand.

You can only challenge the government's bad faith. This automatic permanent gag rule very likely violates the first amendment, as two courts have already found. We ought to have real protections. We ought to have some procedural safeguards in the PATRIOT Act such as our entire American tradition demands.

The conference report does not replace the section 215 showing of relevance standard with the three-part test that was the basis of the Senate compromise which provided some meaningful due process protections. It should.

The conference report does not restore the section 505 previous standard

of specific and articulable facts connecting the records sought to a suspected terrorist. It should.

The conference report does not allow recipients of section 215 orders and national security letters a meaningful court challenge to the gag order. It should.

And, finally, the conference report does not sunset section 505, national security letters, in 4 years. It should.

I very much urge defeat of this PATRIOT Act reauthorization so that we can mend the bill so it doesn't destroy our constitutional liberties. Mend it, not end it. But this doesn't help.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I would just say to this side, this bill has gone through so many iterations, and so many times we have looked at this. It includes 30 additional civil liberties safeguards. And, you know, I admit that your fighting against this bill has probably improved it a little bit.

But at this point, we have done so much to help it. I think it is a very good bill. I commend the author, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for his patience all during this process.

These new civil liberty safeguards include allowing recipients of search requests or national security letters to seek legal counsel for appealing the decision to the FISA court and mandated reporting to the public and Congress on the use of national security letters, data-mining and delayed-notice search warrants.

This is a vigilant protector of civil rights and national security, and it is the right balance. It is critical that we pass this bill today. I would say in passing that part of the PATRIOT Act was a cargo amendment that I included. I thank the chairman for allowing me to do that.

In Florida alone, local and State agencies joined together and developed a unified strategy for prevention and enforcement against cargo theft, resulting in about a 25 percent decrease in cargo thefts. Unfortunately, my colleagues, the FBI estimates, and these are only estimates because we do not have any way to track this information, overall national loss from cargo theft remains at almost \$6 billion annually.

The interagency cooperation must be expanded from the State level to include nation-wide enforcement. Cargo theft imperils our Nation's security, and data indicates profits from cargo theft often go to organized crime or to terrorist activities.

So for that reason, for 2 years I have been working on this amendment, which is included as part of the PATRIOT Act, to, first of all, combat this crime by increasing mandatory minimum sentencing and directing consolidation of cargo theft trend data—simple collection of this cargo theft trend data into the federal Uniform Crime Reporting system, so in fact that system we have a better understanding of

it, and we can coordinate between different law enforcement agencies.

These are vital steps to fight this growing nation-wide threat, and I am pleased to have it included in the PATRIOT Act.

I ask my colleagues to realize the amount of work that has gone into this bill. It is absolutely necessary we pass it. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman for your efforts to pass this critical legislation.

Our founding fathers knew our young Nation faced dangerous security challenges from its amorphous and expansive border and aggressive European powers. With that in mind, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance."

The situation confronting us today mirrors that of our founders. Our border is even larger and more difficult to control. With additional points of entry at every airport, prohibiting entry of those intent on doing harm is even more complex. Advanced technologies allow individuals across the oceans to coordinate attacks within our cities. This is an eventuality impossible for our founding fathers to foresee, and yet necessary for us to combat. We must keep pace with the changing environment. The PATRIOT Act equips us to do that by breaking down communication barriers between law enforcement and intelligence agencies, a weakness identified by the 9/11 Commission.

In Florida, law enforcement increased inter-agency cooperation with impressive results. In 2001, local and state agencies joined together and developed a unified strategy for prevention and enforcement against cargo theft, resulting in a 25% decrease in cargo thefts. Unfortunately, the FBI estimates overall national loss from cargo theft remains more than \$6 billion annually. Interagency cooperation must be expanded from the state level to include nationwide enforcement. Cargo theft imperils our national security, and data indicates profits from cargo theft often funds organized crime or terrorist activities. For two years, I have worked to pass legislation combating this crime by increasing mandatory minimum sentences and directing consolidation of cargo theft trend data into the federal Uniform Crime Reporting system to better coordinate enforcement activities. These are vital steps to fight this growing nationwide threat, and I am pleased they were included in this PATRIOT Act reauthorization.

As we debate these amendments to the PATRIOT Act, I hear echoes of another founding father's words. Benjamin Franklin's assertion that, "They who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety," resounds as an admonition to those of us standing in this chamber to ensure proper oversight and protect civil liberties.

This legislation includes 30 additional civil liberties safeguards. These include: allowing recipients of search requests or National Security Letters to seek legal counsel for appealing the decision to the FISA Court, and mandated reporting to the public and Congress on the use of National Security Letters, data mining, and delayed notice search warrants.

As vigilant protectors of national security, and critical guardians of civil liberties, with full

realization of the immediate threat we face, I call upon my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Due diligence has been observed . . . investigated . . . executed . . . and critiqued. Now it is time to pass this Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, this is an extremely important debate. I want to begin by expressing my disappointment that this bill is being considered as a suspension along with the naming of post offices. Well, you know what, this is not a post-office-naming bill. This is a bill that deals with constitutional rights. It is an issue about which seven States in this country have raised concerns, as have hundreds of municipalities from one end of America to the other.

This is a bill that should allow for amendments and serious debate and not be considered simply as a suspension.

Madam Speaker, many Americans are wondering how it could be that in terms of national security, our President believes that it is okay for a foreign government with terrorist ties to run major ports in America; that that is okay. But when some of us say that maybe kids or just ordinary American citizens should be allowed to read the books that they want in libraries without being investigated by government agents, without any evidence that they are engaged in terrorist activities or have any ties to terrorism, that we cannot protect.

Madam Speaker, there is growing concern in this country with regard to the state of our civil liberties and our constitutional rights. Whether it is the President of the United States engaging, through the NSA, in illegal wiretaps without court orders, or the widespread use of national security letters, millions of Americans, whether they are progressives, whether they are conservatives or in between, are very concerned about Big Brother investigating the private lives, the private reading habits of ordinary Americans.

Madam Speaker, in June of 2005, I offered an amendment that passed with a very strong bipartisan vote, which said that libraries and book stores should be exempt from section 215, that it is wrong for the government to be able to access the reading records or the book purchases of innocent Americans unless they can establish that those individuals have ties with terrorism.

All of us want our government to be vigorous in protecting the American people against terrorism. But we want to do that in a way that does not undermine the constitutional rights of the American people. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership took that amendment, which passed with strong bipartisan support, and they tossed it out. They rejected the will of a vast

majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and did not incorporate that language into the final bill.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue of huge consequence. Fighting terrorism is an enormously important issue, but we can and must do it without undermining the constitutional rights of the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as I indicated before, we need to have hearings on the NSA wiretaps. The question there is not whether or not the wiretaps can take place, but whether or not they take place in the concept of checks and balances.

Also, we need to know what kinds of wiretaps are going on, and it would be nice to have hearings on that before we consider the PATRIOT Act. But when one of the previous speakers talked about the due process involved, we have to remind people that the due process is not for the person whose records are being gathered, but due process on the library that does not have enough money to operate the library, whether or not they have a right to go out and hire a lawyer to protect somebody else's rights.

The person affected does not have any rights in this situation. It is just the library and their own good will. If they want to go out and protect somebody's rights, they have that opportunity. These are extraordinary rights, police rights and police powers; and we need to make sure that people actually understand what is going on here.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Madam Speaker, it has been said that there have been no abuses of the PATRIOT Act. Let me just run down what has already been reported, and probably there have been more, since we filed our report.

It was used against Brandon Mayfield, a Muslim American, to tap his phone, seize his property, copy his computer files, spy on his children, take his DNA, all without his knowledge.

It has been used to deny, on account of his political beliefs, the admission to the United States of a Swiss citizen and prominent Muslim scholar to teach at Notre Dame University. It has been used to unconstitutionally coerce an Internet service provider to divulge information about e-mail activity and Web surfing on its system, and then gag that provider from even disclosing the abuse to the public.

Because of gag restrictions, we will never know how many times it has

been used to obtain reading records from libraries and book stores, but we do know that libraries have been solicited by the Department of Justice, voluntarily or under threat of the PATRIOT Act, for reading information on more than 200 occasions since September 11.

Finally, it has been used to charge and detain and prosecute Muslim students in Idaho for posting Internet Web site links to objectionable material.

Let us not support this PATRIOT Act today.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I can't believe what I have heard from my friends on the other side of the aisle. If they succeed in defeating this bill, it is a case of being sorry for getting what you ask for. This bill actually puts more civil liberties protections into the PATRIOT Act than the conference report which has already been passed by both Houses and is ready to be enrolled and sent to the President for his signature.

So if you have your way and you vote down the bill that was authored by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Senator SUNUNU, you are not going to have the additional civil liberties protections that are contained in Senate 2271. That is not going to stop the conference report which you opposed in December, as is your right, from going to the President and being signed without these additional civil liberties protections.

If you are for more civil liberties protections in the PATRIOT Act, vote for this bill. If you are against them, vote against this bill. But the fate of this bill has no bearing on the fact that the conference report on the PATRIOT Act reauthorization has been cleared by both Houses and is ready to go to the White House. So think before you vote "no." I am voting "aye" because this is a good bill, and we ought to vote on this bill based upon what is in it rather than what is in other legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2271, a bill that circumvents the regular legislative process and fails to truly improve the PATRIOT Act.

Last year, I rejected the PATRIOT Act reauthorization and the conference report because I thought Congress could strike a more reasonable balance in empowering law enforcement and protecting civil liberties. I was concerned then, as I am now, that the reauthorization language would remove the protection of sunsets to most of the PATRIOT Act, which was critical to earn support for such sweeping legislation in 2001. These sunset provisions ensure that Congress will continuously be able to take a closer look at how law enforcement powers are implemented and the effectiveness of balancing security and freedom. I continue to believe that Congressional oversight over one of the most fundamental challenges of our time would not hinder our society but enhance it.

First, let us be clear about what we are voting on today—an amendment to a conference

report. Conference reports are not amendable. Conference reports are the product of conference committees that have hammered out the differences between House and Senate versions of legislation. A conference report is one of the last stages of the legislative process and it must be wholly rejected or accepted by the two chambers.

Since the Majority and the Administration cannot pass the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report on its merits through the regular legislative process, the House must now consider a bill that amends the report. Instead of being honest with the American people that the conference report is flawed, the Majority is attempting to maneuver legislation through the House that they purport will "fix" the underlying problems of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization and fast-track the bill to President Bush's desk.

Even if this "fix" was added to the conference report, many discrepancies in the protection of privacy, civil liberties and Congressional oversight still remain. For example, with no meaningful changes to the conference report, access is still allowed to sensitive personal records, including medical, business and library records (Section 215) and national security letters that request personal information are still issued with no judicial review (Section 505).

Today, I reject the idea that the Majority and the Administration can use this bill as political cover to gain enough support for passage of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization. The fact remains that the PATRIOT Act reauthorization still needs more work, more safeguards, and more oversight. As the 109th Congress continues to discuss protecting the homeland and civil liberties, I challenge my colleagues to have an open review and debate on improving the PATRIOT Act, and to work together—in a bipartisan manner—to strengthen national security in a way that is consistent with the fundamental rights and freedoms this country was founded on.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I strongly support the PATRIOT Act, which plays an instrumental role in the detection and prevention of terrorist attacks.

Terrorists will strike again. It is not a question of if, but of when, where and of what magnitude. We are in a race to stop the terrorists before they use weapons of mass destruction against us.

The PATRIOT Act empowers our intelligence and law enforcement communities to play vital roles in helping the United States win this race.

To fight the war on terrorism, our intelligence agencies must have the right tools. However, with these added tools, there must be added oversight. The protection of our civil liberties is of utmost concern to me.

For this reason, Congresswoman MALONEY and I have offered H.R. 1310, the Protection of Civil Liberties Act, which would reconstitute the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board as an independent agency within the Executive Branch.

The establishment and adequate funding of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board was a crucial recommendation by the 9/11 Commission. In its Final Report on 9/11 Commission recommendations, the commission notes "very little urgency" and "insufficient" funding as it relates to the establishment of the Board.

The bottom line is, we can no longer think in terms of the Cold War paradigm of contain-

ment, reaction and mutually-assured destruction. The modern threat requires us to detect and prevent attacks.

The PATRIOT Act improves our anti-terrorism capabilities by focusing on intelligence gathering, immigration, criminal justice and the financial infrastructure.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 2271, the "USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006."

I am strongly committed to fighting and winning the war on terror. The most solemn obligation of government is to protect the citizenry, and we need to make sure that law enforcement has the powers it needs to do so.

At the same time, governments throughout history, including our own, have abused their authority in the name of promoting such security. Americans should feel comfortable that while government is protecting them from others, their private lives are protected from unwarranted government intrusion. The right to privacy is one of our most precious rights, a hallmark of the American experiment.

I opposed the initial USA PATRIOT Act in 2001 because it threatened our civil liberties. As I have said before, while the compromise makes some improvements to the original USA PATRIOT Act, it does not go far enough to preserve civil liberties.

It will remain too easy for the government to fish through the private information of innocent Americans. This includes medical, gun, library, and financial records. Institutions that receive requests for information are still prevented from talking about them, and their ability to successfully challenge these "gag orders" is limited or nonexistent. Government's power to conduct secret searches of one's personal effects without prior notice, so called "sneak and peak" authority, remains too expansive.

S. 2271 only makes three changes to the prior act. First, it allows recipients of Section 215 orders to challenge accompanying "gag orders." However, it delays any action for at least one year and makes a successful challenge virtually impossible. Second, it clarifies that recipients of Section 215 orders and National Security Letters (NSLs) do not have to disclose to the government the identities of attorneys consulted to assist in responding to these requests. Finally, it seeks to exclude libraries from the reach of NSLs. Unfortunately, there is considerable disagreement about whether the language in S. 2271 actually will accomplish its goal of clarifying that libraries are not subject to NSLs.

These changes, taken as a whole, are at best small improvements which, most significantly, do not address the larger concerns I discussed earlier. As such, I cannot endorse S. 2271 and this reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.

I am pleased that Senator SPECTER and others have said they will revisit the USA PATRIOT Act to deal with the many problems that remain. I look forward to a new bill that more properly balances our need to protect civil liberties and provide tools necessary in fighting terrorism.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, the Patriot Act Conference Report which Congress will amend today deals with the outcry leveled at provisions in the original Patriot Act that allow the government to have access to library records.

I strongly agree that the original PATRIOT Act was too broad: it permitted the FBI and

other agencies to issue National Security Letters (NSL)—secret administrative subpoenas—without court approval to obtain a wide range of data from libraries that had little or nothing to do with fighting terrorists.

But embedded in the law was something I felt and still feel was essential to prevent and disrupt terrorist plots: it covered Internet sites at libraries that also function as Internet Service Providers (ISPs), places terrorists use to communicate with each other—something they have done effectively in the effort to evade being monitored.

Though it was extremely unpopular, I voted against early efforts to repeal Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act—the so called Library Provision—because those efforts included ISPs. Last year, Congressman BERNIE SANDERS' amendment Section 215 expressly did not include ISPs, and I spoke for it on the floor.

Today's bill modifies the PATRIOT Act by barring the government from using NSLs to obtain records from libraries functioning in their traditional roles. Only libraries that also function as ISPs are now covered. This compromise is right and the law ensures that we can continue to monitor terrorist activity on the Internet.

In my view, however, we need to do more. Congress should fold additional checks and balances into the NSL process to protect business and other records in the same way this bill protects libraries. Checks and balances—such as those contained in legislation sponsored by the Intelligence Committee Democrats and senior Judiciary Committee Democrats—would subject NSLs to judicial oversight and enhanced congressional scrutiny.

The specter of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil is very real. It is a prospect that keeps me up at night. Clearly, we need modern tools to track 21st century threats, but not at the expense of our precious liberties, which are the essential foundation of American democracy. Today's bill to amend the PATRIOT Act is a step in the right direction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, today, the House considers S. 2271, The USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act.

I opposed the original 2001 PATRIOT Act because it failed to strike an appropriate balance between giving law enforcement agencies the tools necessary to protect Americans from terrorism and maintaining the freedoms that protect America from tyranny. Like the 2001 bill, the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report is unacceptable, and the amendments proposed by S. 2271 again fall short of the mark.

Last year, the Senate unanimously agreed to legislation striking an appropriate balance between security and liberty. That bill offered an opportunity to fight terrorism effectively without giving up our rights and freedoms. By contrast, S. 2271 would make minor changes to the PATRIOT Act, and the final result falls well short of the standard set by the Senate legislation.

We should insist on real PATRIOT Act reform that protects both our safety and our freedom. Until then, I cannot support fig leaf legislation intended to cover up the basic problems of the PATRIOT Act.

You not only have to do the right thing, you have to do it in the right way. This act and these amendments do neither.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose S. 2271, Additional Reauthor-

izing Amendments to the PATRIOT Act. This legislation fails to address any of the core fundamental flaws with the original PATRIOT Act and makes controversial provisions permanent which threaten American's civil liberties. By making the sunset provisions permanent, we are losing the opportunity for a meaningful review.

Time and time again, we have extended the reauthorization deadline in an effort to fix the flaws and yet once more we have brought forth legislation that compromises our civil rights in exchange for government control.

As we saw last year, the administration was cavalier with domestic spying through the National Security Administration. Their ability to undermine the American public should worry my colleagues and makes me question the reasoning behind giving additional authority with the USA Patriot Act.

In S. 2271, a recipient of national security letters (NSL) is able to challenge a nondisclosure (gag) order but they must wait a year until they can file a petition and that order can be renewed indefinitely at the government's discretion, making it harder to challenge.

In addition, S. 2271 fails to provide meaningful protection for the privacy of library patrons and library records. It exempts libraries that operate in their traditional role, but does not exempt those who use or offer electronic communication services such as Internet access.

This legislation gives the administration too much flexibility and does not force Congress to review the act as needed. In a country that prides itself on civil rights and freedom of speech we must have the ability to question and modify legislation. We must maintain a system with checks and balances to ensure that our government works for our citizens in a transparent way.

The lack of transparency is further demonstrated with the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act. Methamphetamine has taken Oregon, as well as this country, by storm. I fully support efforts to combat this epidemic; however, I will not vote for the egregious PATRIOT Act just because it includes methamphetamine provisions. This is a cheap tactic and we should not be using victims of this epidemic as political chess pieces.

I have no doubt that we can keep America safe without compromising our civil liberties. Sadly, the bill does compromise our rights.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, while I will vote for this bill, I cannot be enthusiastic about it because it does very little to improve the laws it amends. And I cannot help regretting that the House is not being allowed to even consider improving the bill itself.

By refusing to allow any amendments to be considered, the Republican leadership not only is missing an opportunity to refine and clarify the language of this Senate bill, it is insisting on preventing any attempt to broaden the bill so it will do more to strike the right balance between fighting terrorism and respecting civil liberties. This is not the right way for us to do our work.

The bill in effect amends the conference report on H.R. 3199, the bill to revise and renew various provisions of the "USA PATRIOT Act" (more commonly called simply the "PATRIOT Act") that was passed by the House last year.

I voted against that conference report.

I support renewing the new tools the PATRIOT Act provided to fight terrorists. But I

also thought then—and still think today—Congress should take care to protect Americans' civil liberties. And, after careful review, I concluded that the conference report did not do enough to reduce the potential that the authority it gives to the FBI and other agencies could be abused or misused in ways that intrude on Americans' privacy and civil liberties—a potential that has led more than 300 communities as well as Colorado and six other States—governments that in all represent over 62 million people—to pass resolutions opposing parts of the PATRIOT Act.

I had hoped I could vote for the conference report, because earlier the Senate, to its credit, did a better job than the House in responding to the concerns that prompted such resolutions, while still providing ample tools that the government can use to work against the threat of more terrorist attacks, at home and abroad.

I could have supported enactment of the bill as passed by the Senate, and I hoped that the conference report would closely resemble that Senate-passed bill. Unhappily, those hopes were not fulfilled—but I took new hope when the Senate refused to cut off debate on the conference report and it became clear that there would be an effort to revise it to address concerns about its effects on civil liberties.

Specifically, I hoped that the conference report would be revised to include provisions like those in H.R. 1526, the "Security and Freedom Ensured Act of 2005," or SAFE Act. I am a cosponsor of that bill, which would amend the PATRIOT Act in several important ways.

It would modify the provisions regarding "roving wiretaps" to require that: (1) an order approving an electronic surveillance specify either the identity of the target or the place to be wiretapped; and (2) surveillance is to be conducted only when the suspect is present.

It would revise provisions governing so-called "sneak and peek" search warrants to: (1) limit them to cases where immediate notice of issuance would endanger someone's life or physical safety, result in flight from prosecution or intimidation of a potential witness, or lead to destruction of or tampering with evidence sought; and (2) require notice of the warrant within 7 days (instead of just a "reasonable period") after execution, with extensions for additional periods of up to 21 days if the court finds reasonable cause.

It would require the FBI to have a more specific reason to seek to obtain that person's business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations.

It would provide that libraries shall not be treated as wire or electronic communication service providers under provisions granting counterintelligence access to provider subscriber information, toll billing records, or electronic communication transactional records.

It would redefine "domestic terrorism" to mean activities that involve acts dangerous to human life that constitute a Federal crime of terrorism. And it would add several provisions to the list subject to "sunset," so that Congress would have more incentive to review their implementation and to consider possible changes.

I think the SAFE Act sets an appropriate standard for legislation to revise and reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

Unfortunately, the conference report did not meet that standard, and even more unfortunately the negotiations that followed the Senate's refusal to end debate on the conference

report did not result in legislation that would bring the conference report into line with the "SAFE" Act.

Instead, those negotiations resulted in the bill now before the House, on which the only choice allowed by the Republican leadership is "yes" or "no."

The bill would make some revisions in the conference report. Specifically, it would—(1) allow recipients of a production order under Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act to ask a judge of the special court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) to modify or quash the "gag rule" that bars disclosure of the order; (2) end the rule that recipients of a Section 215 order or national security letter (NSL) must name any attorney consulted about the order or NSL; and (3) clarify that libraries, the services of which include offering patrons access to the Internet, are not subject to NSLs, unless they are functioning as electronic communication service providers.

However, a challenge to the gag rule could not be brought until a year after an order or NSL is issued, and the bill would establish as conclusive a government certification that a waiver may endanger national security unless it was made in bad faith.

At best, these are very minor improvements in the conference report. And the language of the bill is not without ambiguity on several points—which is why the Republican leadership should have allowed consideration of clarifying amendments.

But, unfortunately, both the House and the Senate have approved the conference report and it is ready to go to the President to be signed into law. So, the choice now before the House is whether to pass this bill or whether we instead will allow the conference report to become law without even these minor improvements.

And on that question, I think our country is better served by enactment of this inadequate and incomplete bill than by its defeat—and so I will vote for it.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, contrary to its proponents' claims, S. 2271 fails to address the constitutional flaws in the PATRIOT Act or protect innocent Americans against future abuses of their civil liberties. Rather, passing this bill makes the permanent authorization of most of the act inevitable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against S. 2271 in order to force the House and Senate to craft a new legislation giving the government the tools necessary to fight terrorism without sacrificing constitutional liberties.

The Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee essentially admitted that S. 2271 does nothing to address the core concerns constitutionalists and civil libertarians have with the PATRIOT Act. In fact, he has announced his intention to introduce his own PATRIOT Act reform bill! However, if S. 2271 passes and PATRIOT Act extension becomes law, it is highly unlikely that this Congress will consider any other PATRIOT Act reform legislation.

USA Today's Editorial of March 1, "Patriot Act 'compromise' trades liberty for safety," accurately describes how people concerned about individual liberty should react to S. 2271's "reforms": "Big Deal. By any standard of respect for the Bill of Rights, those provisions never should have been in the law in the first place. What is it about the Fourth Amendment ('The right of the people to be secure

... against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated') that Congress doesn't get?"

Among S. 2271's flaws are provisions restricting recipients of a "gag" order regarding government seizure of private records from seeking judicial review of such orders for a year and requiring that recipients prove government officials acted in "bad faith," a ridiculously high standard, simply to be able to communicate that the government has ordered them to turn over private records. The bill also requires that recipients of National Security Letters, which can be abused to sidestep the requirements of the Fourth Amendment, provide the FBI with the names of any attorneys from whom they have sought legal counsel from. S. 2271 would thus prohibit a National Security Letter recipient from even asking a lawyer for advice on complying with the letter without having to report it to the FBI. In fact, S. 2271 requires National Security Letter recipients to give the FBI the names of anyone they tell about the letter. This provision will likely have a chilling effect on a recipient of a National Security Letters ability to seek legal advice or other assistance in challenging or even complying with the National Security Letter.

Madam Speaker, S. 2271 does not address the fundamental constitutional problems with the PATRIOT Act. To the contrary, S. 2271 will make most of the PATRIOT Act's dramatic expansions of federal power a permanent feature of American life. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and work to ensure government can effectively fight terrorism without sacrificing the liberty of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271, the PATRIOT Act Amendments.

James Madison, our 4th President, said, "I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

The PATRIOT Act and its subsequent amendments are exactly what the "Father of the Constitution" was talking about.

Democracy means the "common people rule". And the "common people" of the 17th district have proclaimed that Americans should not have to compromise their civil liberties in order to combat extremism. The local governments of Pacific Grove, Salinas, Santa Cruz, and Watsonville, California have all passed resolutions expressing their concerns with the anti-privacy and anti-liberty nature of the PATRIOT Act.

As we promote democracy at other countries, should we not ourselves be practicing and preserving democracy within our own society?

Madam Speaker, I urge a no vote on the PATRIOT Act amendments.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271, the USA PATRIOT Act. Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006. This bill is a great example of what happens when you put Republican Senators in a room with DICK CHENEY to negotiate over Constitutional rights. It's like two foxes negotiating over who can do more damage to the henhouse without upsetting the neighbors.

Examining this deal more closely, we see that giving the American people the right to

consult a lawyer or challenge a gag order in court is somehow considered a concession by the Bush Administration. Other than that, it's the same old PATRIOT Act that criminalizes speech, protest, and meetings of citizens while also eliminating the right to due process and a search warrant.

This bill permanently extends 14 of 16 expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act. Government can still listen in on your phone conversations without any proof that a terrorist is using the phone and can conduct secret searches of your property. The law will still allow our Government to send a letter to your bank, Internet Service Provider, insurance company, or any other business demanding information about you. The only difference is that businesses no longer have to tell the FBI when they consult an attorney about the request.

A government official can still forbid a business from telling anyone that records have been obtained, although this gag would last for an initial one-year period rather than indefinitely. However, the gag can be renewed and doing so is actually made easier by this supposed grand compromise. Finally, the Bush Administration has magnanimously agreed not to look at your library borrowing records, although this agreement makes it easier for them to find out what websites you visit while at the library.

Madam Speaker, the PATRIOT Act can never be fixed because it starts with the fundamental presumption that the Constitution gets in the way of protecting Americans. In fact, we need the Constitution more than ever to protect us from politicians who think they're above the law.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 2271. This bill makes a few cosmetic changes, but the changes do little to address the serious civil liberties concerns that I and countless Americans have raised during the debate over the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

For example, nothing has been done to integrate needed checks and balances into the National Security Letter (NSL) process. NSLs are requests for financial, telecommunications, credit, and other business records issued directly by government agencies in national security investigations without the approval of a judge. Before the PATRIOT Act, the FBI and other issuing agencies could issue an NSL only if there was some nexus to an agent of a foreign power or terrorist. Post-PATRIOT Act, the government only has to show the request is relevant to an investigation. The lowering of this standard has resulted in an all-time high number of NSLs issued. Passage of this legislation will do nothing to change this disturbing trend or enhance congressional or judicial oversight over NSLs.

This bill also fails to address issues related to the President's National Security Agency (NSA) domestic surveillance program. I strongly believe this program must be subject to statutory restrictions, including the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). Congress should not stand by in silence and allow this controversial program to continue unchecked.

Unfortunately, in spite of having adequate time to engage in constructive discussions to fix the PATRIOT Act reauthorization Conference Report, the sponsors of S. 2271 chose again to exclude Democrats from negotiations. Instead, they've offered a bill that

makes only a few superficial changes to the Conference Report, and because this bill is being considered under suspension of the rules, we don't have an opportunity to offer meaningful amendments that could greatly improve the PATRIOT Act and ensure the protection of privacy and civil liberties as well as our national security.

I oppose this bill and find it regrettable that an important opportunity to initiate real reforms to this legislation has been squandered.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, later this afternoon we will consider additional reauthorizing amendments to the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act Conference Report is a balance between liberty and security. Chairman SENSENBRENNER and those of us serving on the House Judiciary Committee dedicated ourselves to achieving this end. The additional safeguards that we will agree to today will further enhance the safety and security of the American people, and I enthusiastically support that. It is time, after two extensions and a debate worthy of the high standards of American democracy, that we send the PATRIOT Act to the President for his signature.

We all lived through September 11th. I was here at the Capitol that day. I saw the evil of our enemies written in the smoke rising above the Pentagon. And we are reminded yet today that their desire to do such violence in our homeland and in the homeland of our allies is real.

Since September 11th, we have seen attacks on buses and subway cars in London, attacks on commuter trains in Madrid, hotel bombings in Amman, and nightclub bombings in Bali. Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri have spoken recently in videotapes expressing their desire to bring further terrorist destruction upon America. There is no doubt that we are under an extreme threat each day. However, there also is no doubt about America's determination to protect itself.

Just recently the President recounted how a planned al Qaeda attack on an office tower in Los Angeles was thwarted, thanks in part to the tools provided under the PATRIOT Act. The information sharing provisions of the PATRIOT Act also have enabled investigators to break-up terror cells in Portland, Oregon and Lackawanna, New York. Thwarting terrorist attacks such as these at home is accomplished by the hard work of the men and women in the law enforcement and intelligence communities. But, it also is done by making sure that these brave men and women have available to them the powers necessary to do the job, such as those in the PATRIOT Act.

For that reason, making permanent 14 of the 16 expiring PATRIOT Act provisions is so important. The two remaining provisions, Section 206 which authorizes roving wiretaps used by law enforcement to perform surveillance on terrorists or spies who throwaway their cell phones and change locations frequently and Section 215 which authorizes the FBI to ask the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Courts to issue an order for business records of terrorists to be used by the FBI in its investigations, are extended for 4 years.

We must equip law enforcement and intelligence officials with the tools necessary for them to protect Americans from terrorist attacks. We also must safeguard the precious civil rights and liberties that make our lives so free and fulfilling. We are doing both today. Madam Speaker, our solemn duty is to protect

Americans from terrorists and safeguard their civil liberties, and today we fulfill that duty by passing this bill and sending the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act to the President to sign.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2271.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

STOP COUNTERFEITING IN MANUFACTURED GOODS ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 32) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in counterfeit marks.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.*—

(1) *SHORT TITLE.*—This section may be cited as the "Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act".

(2) *FINDINGS.*—The Congress finds that—

(A) the United States economy is losing millions of dollars in tax revenue and tens of thousands of jobs because of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of counterfeit goods;

(B) the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection estimates that counterfeiting costs the United States \$200 billion annually;

(C) counterfeit automobile parts, including brake pads, cost the auto industry alone billions of dollars in lost sales each year;

(D) counterfeit products have invaded numerous industries, including those producing auto parts, electrical appliances, medicines, tools, toys, office equipment, clothing, and many other products;

(E) ties have been established between counterfeiting and terrorist organizations that use the sale of counterfeit goods to raise and launder money;

(F) ongoing counterfeiting of manufactured goods poses a widespread threat to public health and safety; and

(G) strong domestic criminal remedies against counterfeiting will permit the United States to seek stronger anticounterfeiting provisions in bilateral and international agreements with trading partners.

(b) *TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT MARKS.*—Section 2320 of title 18, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after "such goods or services" the following: "

or intentionally traffics or attempts to traffic in labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature, knowing that a counterfeit mark has been applied thereto, the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive,".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The following property shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States and no property right shall exist in such property:

"(A) Any article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark used in committing a violation of subsection (a).

"(B) Any property used, in any manner or part, to commit or to facilitate the commission of a violation of subsection (a).

"(2) The provisions of chapter 46 of this title relating to civil forfeitures, including section 983 of this title, shall extend to any seizure or civil forfeiture under this section. At the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court, unless otherwise requested by an agency of the United States, shall order that any forfeited article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed or otherwise disposed of according to law.

"(3)(A) The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of an offense under this section, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed, that the person forfeit to the United States—

"(i) any property constituting or derived from any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of the offense;

"(ii) any of the person's property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, facilitate, aid, or abet the commission of the offense; and

"(iii) any article that bears or consists of a counterfeit mark used in committing the offense.

"(B) The forfeiture of property under subparagraph (A), including any seizure and disposition of the property and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the procedures set forth in section 413 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) of that section. Notwithstanding section 413(h) of that Act, at the conclusion of the forfeiture proceedings, the court shall order that any forfeited article or component of an article bearing or consisting of a counterfeit mark be destroyed.

"(4) When a person is convicted of an offense under this section, the court, pursuant to sections 3556, 3663A, and 3664, shall order the person to pay restitution to the owner of the mark and any other victim of the offense as an offense against property referred to in section 3663A(c)(1)(A)(ii).

"(5) The term 'victim', as used in paragraph (4), has the meaning given that term in section 3663A(a)(2)."

(3) Subsection (e)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) a spurious mark—

"(i) that is used in connection with trafficking in any goods, services, labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature;

"(ii) that is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a mark registered on the principal register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office and in use, whether or not the defendant knew such mark was so registered;

"(iii) that is applied to or used in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, or is applied to or consists of a label, patch, sticker, wrapper, badge, emblem, medallion, charm, box, container, can, case,

hangtag, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature that is designed, marketed, or otherwise intended to be used on or in connection with the goods or services for which the mark is registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office; and

“(iv) the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive; or”;

(B) by amending the matter following subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“but such term does not include any mark or designation used in connection with goods or services, or a mark or designation applied to labels, patches, stickers, wrappers, badges, emblems, medallions, charms, boxes, containers, cans, cases, hangtags, documentation, or packaging of any type or nature used in connection with such goods or services, of which the manufacturer or producer was, at the time of the manufacture or production in question, authorized to use the mark or designation for the type of goods or services so manufactured or produced, by the holder of the right to use such mark or designation.”.

(4) Section 2320 is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) Nothing in this section shall entitle the United States to bring a criminal cause of action under this section for the repackaging of genuine goods or services not intended to deceive or confuse.”.

(c) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—

(1) REVIEW AND AMENDMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States Sentencing Commission, pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this subsection, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 2318 or 2320 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) AUTHORIZATION.—The United States Sentencing Commission may amend the Federal sentencing guidelines in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 21(a) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note) as though the authority under that section had not expired.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION.—In carrying out this subsection, the United States Sentencing Commission shall determine whether the definition of “infringement amount” set forth in application note 2 of section 2B5.3 of the Federal sentencing guidelines is adequate to address situations in which the defendant has been convicted of one of the offenses listed in paragraph (1) and the item in which the defendant trafficked was not an infringing item but rather was intended to facilitate infringement, such as an anti-circumvention device, or the item in which the defendant trafficked was infringing and also was intended to facilitate infringement in another good or service, such as a counterfeit label, documentation, or packaging, taking into account cases such as *U.S. v. Sung*, 87 F.3d 194 (7th Cir. 1996).

SEC. 2. TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Protecting American Goods and Services Act of 2005”.

(b) COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.—Section 2320(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ means to transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of, to another, for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain, or to make, import, export, obtain control of, or possess, with intent to so transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose of;”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the term ‘financial gain’ includes the receipt, or expected receipt, of anything of value; and”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SOUND RECORDINGS AND MUSIC VIDEOS OF LIVE MUSICAL PERFORMANCES.—Section 2319A(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title.”.

(2) COUNTERFEIT LABELS FOR PHONORECORDS, COMPUTER PROGRAMS, ETC.—Section 2318(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of this title.”.

(3) ANTI-BOTLEGGING.—Section 1101 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘traffic’ has the same meaning as in section 2320(e) of title 18.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 32 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act. This legislation, which is substantially similar to legislation that passed the House by voice vote in May of 2005, contains important provisions to facilitate efforts by the Department of Justice to prosecute those who exploit the good names of companies by attaching counterfeit marks to substandard products.

As amended by the other body, H.R. 32 includes changes to the definition of “traffic” contained in Federal counterfeiting statutes to permit the prosecution of persons who import or export counterfeit products or possess counterfeit products with the intent to transport, transfer, or distribute such products.

Counterfeiting is a serious problem. Legitimate businesses work hard to build public trust and confidence in their products. When a legitimate company's name is attached to counterfeit products, that company may suffer financial losses and may also have its reputation tarnished as a result.

In addition, counterfeit products are often purchased unwittingly by consumers who have come to rely on the quality of a product from a company they know and trust. What

unsuspecting consumers of counterfeit products often receive is a low-quality, and potentially dangerous, imitation. Some of these products are such poor imitations of the original that they have caused physical harm to consumers.

The FBI has identified counterfeit goods in a wide range of products including pharmaceuticals, automobile parts, airplane parts, baby formula, and children's toys. The U.S. automobile industry has reported a number of instances of brake failure caused by counterfeit brake pads manufactured from wooden chips. Counterfeits of other products, such as prescription or over-the-counter medications, may have serious health consequences if consumed by consumers.

Under this legislation, section 2320 of title 18 would be expanded to include penalties for those who traffic in counterfeit labels, symbols, or packaging of any type knowing that a counterfeit mark has been applied. Additionally, H.R. 32 would require the forfeiture of any property derived directly or indirectly from the proceeds of the violations as well as any property used, or intended to be used, in relation to the offense. It also requires that restitution be paid to the owner of the mark that was counterfeited.

In fiscal year 2003, the Department of Homeland Security reported 6,500 seizures of counterfeit-branded goods including cigarettes, books, apparel, handbags, toys, and electronic games with an estimated street value of \$94 million. According to the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the number of seizures for violations of intellectual property rights increased by 11.8 percent between fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 to 7,255 seizures for an estimated value of \$139 million. Fortune 500 companies are spending between \$2 million and \$4 million a year each to fight the counterfeiters.

The counterfeiting of manufactured goods produces staggering losses to businesses across the United States and around the world. Counterfeit products deprive the Treasury of tax revenues, add to the national trade deficit, subject consumers to health and safety risks, and leave consumers without any legal recourse when they are financially or physically injured by counterfeit products.

In addition, established links between counterfeiting, terrorism, and organized crime have made this a priority for Federal law enforcement agencies. H.R. 32 will help the Federal Government stop the wave of counterfeit products flooding the marketplace.

Before closing, I would like to thank and congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the author of the House-passed legislation, for his tireless efforts to address the counterfeiting problem. He has crafted a good piece of legislation that has broad bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I support this bill with great enthusiasm. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). No one has worked harder on the committee than this gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act.

The bill amends existing law in a matter designed to intensify the effort to prevent counterfeiting of goods. Counterfeited goods victimize the manufacturer and shortchange purchasers with substandard products. They also expose all of us to risks from unsafe products and deprive Americans of jobs and other benefits from commerce when the authentic goods are not sold.

The sale of counterfeit goods is illegal. This bill clarifies any ambiguity there may be in present law. Madam Speaker, when we began working on this bill on a bipartisan basis at the subcommittee level, there was a concern when drafted that the bill went too far and actually criminalizes current legitimate, time-honored practices by law-abiding merchants who legally purchased authentic goods and repackaged them in various ways to enhance sales of such goods.

We forged an agreement which addressed this potential problem to the satisfaction of all those who had expressed concerns about it. So this bill addresses the problem of counterfeiting of manufactured goods in a manner that should now be considered non-controversial.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I support the bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the author of the bill.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to speak on my bill, H.R. 32, the Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act. I sincerely want to salute the chairman, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for the effort he has made. And I also wanted to thank the ranking member, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT and anybody else that wants to rise. I appreciate very much all the hard work and the support you have given this bill.

I introduced this bill last year in response to the concerns of many manufacturing companies about the proliferation of counterfeit products, especially auto parts. Simply put, counterfeit parts and goods cost American jobs. Every year, counterfeiting costs the U.S. an estimated \$200 billion, and that is climbing. Counterfeit auto parts alone cost the automotive supplier industry over \$12 billion annually.

To put it in more tangible terms, it is estimated that if these losses were eliminated, the auto industry could hire 200,000 additional workers.

Counterfeit products not only damage our economy, as the chairman just mentioned; they compromise the safety of all Americans. Counterfeit auto parts, including brake pads, have been found in taxi cabs; fake prescriptions drugs have been confiscated; babies have been fed fake formula; and even, and this is serious, military combat vehicles have received counterfeit parts.

Oftentimes there is no way, virtually no way of telling the difference between a legitimate and a counterfeit product. That is why H.R. 32 prohibits trafficking in also counterfeit labels, patches, and medallions.

This legislation also requires convicted counterfeiters to not only surrender confiscated counterfeit goods but also, more importantly, the equipment used to make those products. H.R. 32 will help to dig up the counterfeiting networks by the roots, to stop criminals from reusing machinery and defrauding the American people.

I do just want to briefly address why we have to pass H.R. 32 again, when the House passed it last year by voice vote. First, the Senate added a technical clarification to address the concerns of some Internet marketplace companies that this bill would unfairly punish them for crimes committed by third parties. I support this technical change. The intent of this bill is not to punish the victims of counterfeit schemes but, rather, to penalize those that blatantly and consciously pursue the sale of counterfeit products.

Second, the Senate added additional anticounterfeit provisions that broaden the activities deemed criminal under current law to include international property violations, and I fully support the addition of these provisions.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to again thank Judiciary Committee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER for his work on this bill. His committee has been tasked to do so many things over the last several months, so many pressing issues; and it took some time to bring this about. I sincerely appreciate everything he has done to bring this along. I also want to thank everybody else who was involved in bringing this bill to a final legislative finish.

We should all be proud of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise proudly in support of this legislation and thank the chairman of the committee and his staff and others for working with us to ensure that this bill does not overreach.

The measure was designed to target illegitimate actors who trade in counterfeit trademarks, ranging from auto parts to fake labels for handbags or cologne. We all agree that manufacturers have a right to ensure that fake goods are not marketed in their names and that their own goods are not marketed under fake names.

The bill as originally written, however, went further than that. It was vague on the issue of whether someone other than the manufacturer could affix marks to goods that correctly identify the source of the goods. This struck at the very heart of the parallel market in which third parties lawfully obtain genuine goods and make them available in discount stores without deception. Not only has this practice been upheld by the Supreme Court, but it also saves consumers billions of dollars each year.

Through negotiation with the majority and affected parties, we have been able to revise the legislation to protect manufacturers, target illegitimate actors, and leave a legitimate industry unscathed. More specifically, because the bill amends the definition of a counterfeit trademark to include packaging and labeling formats which can be used lawfully by a variety of businesses, the new language clarifies that the repackaging of goods that were made under the authority of the United States trademark owner is not prohibited.

□ 1545

Such repackaging can include combining single products into gift sets, separating combination sets of goods into individual items for resale, inserting coupons into original packaging or repackaged items, affixing labels to track or otherwise identify products, removing goods from original packaging for customized retail displays, and moving products from large end caps or display modules into smaller cases.

In deciding whether to bring a cause of action under the new law in situations involving the repackaging of genuine goods, it is expected that the government will consider evidence that clearly shows an intent to deceive or confuse. Such evidence could come in the form of altering, concealing or obliterating expiration dates or information important to the consumer use of the product; for example: safety and health information about the quality, performance or use of the product or service; statements or other markings that a used, discarded or refurbished product is new; or statements or other markings that the product meets testing and certification requirements. Also relevant to a decision to bring a criminal action would be a meaningful variance from product testing and certification requirements, placing seals on product containers that have been opened or otherwise adulterating the genuine product.

Finally, the bill was modified to clarify that it was not intended to allow criminal actions against persons who, with no intent to deceive or confuse, traffic in goods or services that were originally manufactured under the authority of the United States trademark owner. In this regard, the phrase "the use of which is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive"

is not intended to create a new element for this cause of action but, instead, reiterates what is already reflected in the definition of "counterfeit mark."

So I congratulate the bipartisan effort that made this measure far more useful and appealing, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GILLMOR. Madam Speaker, as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 32, I am proud to rise in support of this important legislation.

Each year, counterfeit manufactured goods cost American companies billions in lost revenue and exacerbate the global challenges that this sector of our economy already face on a daily basis. Madam Speaker, in my district alone, manufacturing accounts for 50 percent of all jobs. This legislation will make a significant impact in ensuring that northwest Ohio's long and vibrant manufacturing history is not lost as a result of criminal actions designed to make a quick profit and deprive consumers of high-quality manufactured goods. Finally, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for his leadership on this legislation as well as my colleague from Wisconsin, the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for ushering it to the floor just two weeks before National Manufacturing Week is set to kickoff.

Madam Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to show their support for the manufacturing community by voting in favor of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 32, the "Stop Counterfeiting in Manufactured Goods Act." This legislation responds to a serious and growing problem: the trafficking of counterfeit goods.

We've all seen movies in which someone buys what looks to be an expensive Rolex watch from a street vendor, only to find out later what they've really purchased is a cheap imitation that doesn't even keep proper time. Lately, it's the DVDs of the movie themselves that are increasingly likely to be counterfeit. In the area of pharmaceuticals, counterfeit drugs are now being sold in this country and around the world. The packaging makes them look like the real thing, but the pills inside often lack the active ingredient people are relying on to treat their illnesses, or contain the wrong active ingredient altogether. According to the Food and Drug Administration, upwards of ten percent of the drugs worldwide are counterfeit. In some countries, it is estimated that more than half the drug supply is made up of counterfeit drugs.

The trade in counterfeit goods has also had a negative impact on the automobile industry, including the auto parts industry. People buy what they believe are name-brand parts, like brake pads and spark plugs, only to find that they spent good money on counterfeit goods that do not meet safety and performance requirements. Beyond the obvious safety problem for consumers, the trade in counterfeit parts costs the automotive parts industry an estimated \$12 billion a year. This is a heavy loss to a U.S. auto parts industry that already faces immense challenges.

The fact of the matter is that—whether it's counterfeit DVDs, video games, medicines, auto parts, or handbags—the United States economy is losing millions of dollars in tax revenue and tens of thousands of jobs because of the manufacture, distribution, and sale of

counterfeit goods. We need new tools to deal with this growing problem, and that's what this legislation does. This bill expands criminal penalties to include those who traffic in counterfeit labels and packaging, setting fines of up to \$2 million and a prison sentence of up to ten years for those who intentionally sell or distribute counterfeit labels and other false packaging. It also requires the offender to make restitution to the owner of the mark. In addition, the bill requires the forfeiture of any property derived from the proceeds of the violation, as well as any property used in connection with the offense.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this needed legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 32.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 681) supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 681

Whereas engineers use their scientific and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill society's needs;

Whereas in just this past year, engineers have helped meet the major technological challenges of our time—from rebuilding towns devastated by natural disasters to designing an information superhighway that will speed our country into the next century;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and demonstration and in transforming scientific discoveries into useful products, and we will look more than ever to engineers and their knowledge and skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering standards that permit modern economies and societies to exist;

Whereas the recent National Academy of Sciences report entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" highlighted the worrisome trend that fewer students are now focusing on engineering in college at a time when increasing numbers of today's 2,000,000 United States engineers are nearing retirement;

Whereas the National Society of Professional Engineers through National Engineers Week and other activities is raising public awareness of engineers' positive contributions to our quality of life;

Whereas National Engineering Week activities at engineering schools and in other forums are encouraging our young math and science students to see themselves as possible future engineers and to realize the practical power of their knowledge;

Whereas National Engineers Week has grown into a formal coalition of more than 70 engineering, education, and cultural societies, and more than 50 major corporations and government agencies;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that our first President, a military engineer and land surveyor, made to engineering; and

Whereas February 19 to 25, 2006, has been designated by the President as National Engineers Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) will work with the engineering community to make sure that the creativity and contribution of that community can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week and its aims to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote literacy in math and science.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 681, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 681, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

In 1951, the National Society of Professional Engineers established National Engineers Week. The purpose of the week is to increase understanding of and interest in engineering and technology careers and to promote K-12 literacy in math and science. It also showcases the contributions that engineers have made to our society. Co-chairs of the 2006 week are the Society of Women Engineers and Northrop Grumman Corporation.

Historically, Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's actual birthday, February 22, as he steered our new Nation toward technical advancements, invention and education. His many credits include an order given at Valley Forge for more engineers and engineering education, an order which led to the creation of the U.S. Army Engineers School.

There is no doubt that we have worked very hard and come a long way

since the days of President Washington to become the world's leader in innovation, and there is no doubt that engineers have been there every step of the way. From landing a man on the Moon to providing new colors in our children's crayon boxes, engineers play a role in nearly every facet of our lives.

I applaud the National Society of Professional Engineers for having this week to raise public awareness of the role engineers have to play in American prosperity. If we are to remain competitive and a world leader, however, it is not only important, but imperative, that we continue to attract young people to this profession. It is imperative that we provide them with the education and tools necessary to excel in this demanding and rewarding profession. It is also imperative that we see that the teachers have not just the knowledge but also the enthusiasm to inspire and stimulate students to excel in math and science.

It is my pleasure to join with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 681, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 681, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. Engineers have helped make our country great, from their service in the American Revolution to developing key modern industries such as aerospace and energy. I would like to honor and recognize the more than 2 million engineers in the United States and the contributions that they have made to our country.

Engineers combine imagination and creativity with math and science training to solve problems. Engineers in the past have helped us to build boats to cross the seas, railroads to take us West, and the Internet to communicate with the world. Today, we need the innovative capabilities of engineers to confront the new challenges before us. Engineers will help America develop energy independence, find solutions to confront global climate change, and make our Nation more secure.

But there is a growing concern that America is falling behind other countries when it comes to engineering. U.S. students continue to score below international averages on math and science tests. In 2004, China graduated more than six times the number of engineers that graduated in the United States. The National Academy of Sciences recently released a report entitled, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which raised questions about America's future technological competitiveness. This report, echoed by President Bush in his State of the Union address, emphasized the need for government to take a number of actions, including addressing the poten-

tial shortage of engineers. We must act quickly to take up this challenge. We cannot afford to let our future falter, and that future requires that we continue to lead the world in technological innovation. This innovation is supplied by engineers.

National Engineers Week seeks to raise public awareness about engineers' contributions to our society and our quality of life and has inspired future engineers for more than 50 years. Founded by the National Society of Professional Engineers, and including more than 100 society, government, and business sponsors and affiliates, including Boeing, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Society of Civil Engineers, National Engineers Week draws upon local and regional experts to promote high levels of math, science and technology literacy. Annually, it reaches thousands of parents, teachers and students in communities across the country. From national and regional engineering competitions, such as the Future City Competition, to events such as Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, this week helps inspire the next generation of engineers and scientists.

The Future City Competition is a great example of how National Engineers Week has touched students across the country. The competition encourages seventh and eighth grade students to use problem-solving skills, teamwork, research and presentation skills, practical math and science applications, and computer skills to present their vision of a city of the future.

The team from St. Barnabas Catholic School in Chicago recently won first place in the regional competition. This team included several students who come from my district. These students then went on to the national competition. At the national competition, they also won an award for their work in aerospace engineering.

These students had a great opportunity to learn more about the many factors that go into building a city. They then applied this knowledge to a real problem. Working with teachers and mentor engineers, they solved problems ranging from energy supply to waste removal to transportation needs. These students are the ones we will rely on in coming years to help us address these challenges in the real world.

If we are going to produce more American engineers, one step that we need to do is to improve our STEM education, that is, science, technology, engineering and math education, but we must also do more to inspire our children to become interested in engineering.

When I was a kid growing up in Chicago, I was fascinated by the way things worked, as most kids are. I had a physics teacher in high school at St. Ignatius. His name was Father Fergus. He took this fascination that I had and got me interested in engineering, just

as I hope that the events of National Engineers Week will do for more children.

I went on to earn a bachelor's of science degree in mechanical engineering at Northwestern and a master's degree in engineering-economic systems from Stanford University. I am one of only nine Members of this body who has an engineering degree, but people come up to me often and ask me how does the training as an engineer help you. Certainly it helps in understanding science and technology issues, math and science education, and transportation and manufacturing issues.

But engineering is more than that. Simply put, engineering is problem solving. Training as an engineer teaches you how to analyze a problem and how to put the steps together to solve that problem, no matter what the problem may be. It helps teach the type of analytical and innovative thinking that has made America a world leader technologically, militarily and economically. We must do everything we can to encourage and inspire future engineers so that America continues to be a leader in this increasingly competitive world.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) for his involvement with the National Engineers Week resolution. I would especially like to thank the engineers who have contributed so much to America, to honor them for their commitment to their continuing work for the betterment of our society.

I ask my colleagues to pass H. Res. 681 in deserved recognition.

□ 1600

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to close, and note that my distinguished colleague from Illinois referenced his engineering education. You notice he stopped short of talking about his Ph.D. in political science. That is where he went to the dark side. He could have fallen into the law after that, even worse. But he came to Congress instead, so we are happy to have him here and happy to have the expertise he offers.

As one of those political scientist undergrads myself, I would point out there are some national security implications to what we are describing here. The United States graduates in order of magnitude something like 60,000 engineers a year. China graduates perhaps north of 200,000. India as well north of 200,000 engineers a year. That has implications for us as a society.

Also, the U.S. Department of Labor predicts that in the future new jobs will require math and science training and technical ability four times more often than other jobs. In other words, there is a growing need, as Mr. LIPINSKI was saying, for people trained in science and math and engineering, in

spite of the fact that out of 100 high school students only two of those students will typically go on to ever get a degree in engineering or science. That is of concern.

And that is why I join with the gentleman from Illinois in urging my colleagues to adopt this resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 681, a resolution recognizing the importance of engineers and supporting National Engineers Week.

From the grandest of skyscrapers to microchips and the smallest of medical devices, engineers continue to design and construct products that are vital to our daily lives and our Nation's economy. Unfortunately, American students today are losing interest in engineering. The National Academy of Sciences report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," notes that, "after secondary school, fewer U.S. students pursue science and engineering degrees than is the case of students in other countries. About 6% of our undergraduates major in engineering; that percentage is the second lowest among developed countries." We need to get American students at all levels back into science and engineering classes. Our Nation's continued global and economic leadership depends on our ability to inspire the next generation of engineers.

H. Res. 681 recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week as an important part of educating and building a competitive workforce for the 21st century. For example, National Engineers Week exposes students that might otherwise never dream of a career in a technical field to opportunities in engineering through programs such as the "Future City Competition" (a contest for middle school student teams to design a visionary city) and the "Global Marathon For, By and About Women in Engineering" (a 24-hour long series of presentations intended to attract young women into the engineering workforce). During this week, students and professionals at all levels will be motivated to explore the vast opportunities open to them in the field of engineering.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the National Society for Professional Engineers for its ongoing efforts to educate children and adults about the importance of engineering. I would also like to thank Congressman INGLIS and Congressman LIPINSKI for their leadership on this important issue. I ask that you join me in recognizing the importance of engineering in our daily lives and the positive impact of National Engineers Week by voting in favor of H. Res. 681.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of H. Res. 681, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

Engineers put ideas into motion. They must possess the creativity and analytical skills to innovate.

Texas is our Nation's energy State. Its roots are in big oil and big skies.

These days, much of the wealth generated by Texas oil is being put to good use to "fuel" the technology economy. Engineers are a critical part of that effort.

Our State is investing millions of dollars to develop cleaner-burning alternative fuels that are more efficient and better for the environ-

ment. Engineers, working behind the scenes, are involved at every stage.

I am proud that my State is showing leadership at a time when this Nation desperately needs to invest more in research, particularly in energy research.

Texas's tenacity and frontier spirit is strong, and I commend engineers in Texas and all over this Nation for the wonderful work they do.

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues on the House Science Committee in support of H. Res. 681 and National Engineers Week.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 681.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4054, by the yeas and nays;

S. 2271, by the yeas and nays.

DEWEY F. BARTLETT POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4054.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4054, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	DeLay	Kanjorski
Aderholt	Dent	Kaptur
Akin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller
Alexander	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly
Allen	Dicks	Kennedy (MN)
Andrews	Dingell	Kennedy (RI)
Baca	Doggett	Kildee
Bachus	Doolittle	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baird	Doyle	Kind
Baker	Drake	King (IA)
Baldwin	Dreier	King (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Duncan	Kingston
Barrow	Edwards	Kirk
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	Kline
Barton (TX)	Emanuel	Knollenberg
Bass	Emerson	Kolbe
Bean	Engel	Kucinich
Beauprez	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)
Becerra	Eshoo	LaHood
Berkley	Etheridge	Langevin
Berman	Everett	Lantos
Berry	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Biggert	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Billirakis	Feeney	Latham
Bishop (GA)	Ferguson	LaTourette
Bishop (NY)	Filner	Leach
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lee
Blackburn	Flake	Levin
Blumenauer	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Blunt	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Boehlert	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Fortenberry	Linder
Bonilla	Fossella	Lipinski
Bonner	Fox	LoBiondo
Bono	Frank (MA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	Lowe
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Boswell	Gallely	Lungren, Daniel
Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	E.
Boustany	Gerlach	Lynch
Boyd	Gibbons	Mack
Bradley (NH)	Gilchrest	Maloney
Brady (PA)	Gillmor	Manzullo
Brown (OH)	Gingrey	Marchant
Brown (SC)	Gohmert	Markey
Brown, Corrine	Goode	Marshall
Brown-Waite,	Goodlatte	Matheson
Ginny	Gordon	Matsui
Burgess	Granger	McCarthy
Butterfield	Graves	McCaul (TX)
Buyer	Green (WI)	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Green, Al	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Green, Gene	McCrery
Campbell (CA)	Grijalva	McDermott
Cannon	Gutknecht	McGovern
Cantor	Hall	McHenry
Capito	Harman	McHugh
Capps	Harris	McIntyre
Capuano	Hart	McKeon
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	McKinney
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Carnahan	Hayes	McNulty
Carson	Hayworth	Meehan
Carter	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Case	Hensarling	Melancon
Castle	Herger	Mica
Chabot	Herseth	Michaud
Chandler	Higgins	Millender
Chocola	Hinchey	McDonald
Clay	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Holden	Miller (NC)
Coble	Holt	Miller, Gary
Cole (OK)	Honda	Miller, George
Conaway	Hoolley	Mollohan
Conyers	Hostettler	Moore (KS)
Cooper	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Costello	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Hunter	Moran (VA)
Crenshaw	Hyde	Murphy
Crowley	Inglis (SC)	Murtha
Cubin	Inslee	Musgrave
Culberson	Israel	Myrick
Cummings	Issa	Nadler
Davis (AL)	Istook	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Neugebauer
Davis (KY)	(TX)	Ney
Davis (TN)	Jefferson	Northup
Davis, Jo Ann	Jenkins	Norwood
Davis, Tom	Jindal	Nunes
Deal (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Nussle
DeFazio	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Delahunt	Jones (NC)	Oliver
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Ortiz

Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger

NAYS—1

Abercrombie

NOT VOTING—18

Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Costa
Cuellar
Davis (FL)
Evans

Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Meeks (NY)
Payne

Reyes
Rush
Solis
Sweeney
Weiner
Wexler

□ 1856

Ms. CARSON changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USA PATRIOT ACT ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2271.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2271, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 138, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—280

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Choccola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly

Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer

Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Pascarell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—138

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Holt

Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kucinich
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver

Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Burton (IN)
Costa
Cuellar
Davis (FL)
Evans

Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Meeks (NY)

Payne
Reyes
Sweeney
Wexler

□ 1916

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. DAVIS of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to illness I was regrettably unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 19 and 20, final passage of H.R. 4054—the “Dewey F. Bartlett Post Office Designation Act” and S. 2271—the “USA PATRIOT Act Additional Reauthorizing Amendments Act of 2006,” respectively.

Had I been here I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 19, and “yea” on rollcall vote 20.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was ill today and, therefore, missed votes in this chamber. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall 19 and “nay” on rollcall vote 20.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4167, NATIONAL FOOD UNIFORMITY ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-386) on the resolution (H. Res. 710) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 415

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 415.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING KIRBY PUCKETT

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, baseball fans everywhere, and in Minnesota in particular, mourn the passing of Kirby Puckett. Kirby Puckett was born to play baseball. He lived for the game. In an era of oversized egos and greed gone mad, he was a throwback to an earlier time.

Kirby was the ultimate underdog. Born to humble beginnings, he related to kids that could not afford to buy an autograph. Like a bumblebee, he did not know that his stubby body could not fly. Propelled only by an infectious enthusiasm, he amazed us with leaping catches that mere mortals would have conceded to the bleachers.

We always knew that with Kirby in the game the underdog Twins always had a chance. With his bat, his glove or with his smile, he made everyone around him play better.

He embodied the essence of all that baseball is supposed to be. The game will go on, new heroes will emerge, but there will never be another Kirby Puckett.

PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold the Constitution dear and I also believe that we can secure our homeland and we can find the right way to do the PATRIOT Act, but it concerns me when we have allowed the expansion of this act to expand the surveillance of Americans.

We did not do what we should have done today because, in fact, national

security letters can be issued to any American without showing any culpability or affiliation with terrorist acts or terrorists. In addition, our libraries are not protected because if you have one Internet service at your library, national security letters can be issued, and the gag order that could have been issued under the old bill immediately now has to wait a year. So that means that you are going to be raided with any materials that the government asks for and you cannot even have a gag order issued.

I know that we can protect the Constitution, the rights of Americans and still protect national security. Why did we not do it right? This is not the right PATRIOT Act, and for that reason, I had to vote "no." I hope we get it right some day and protect the Constitution.

VENEZUELA'S DICTATOR

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that the President of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, is neither a friend of democracy nor a friend of the United States. Mr. Chavez has consistently rattled the anti-United States sabers. He made best friends with Fidel Castro and Cindy Sheehan, and he supported radical revolutionaries in Latin and South American countries.

Mr. Chavez has also radically altered his own country's political institutions, creating a disgusting and disgraceful dictatorship that does not deserve our support.

Why is it then, Mr. Speaker, that the United States gives Mr. Chavez's government millions in direct aid each year? As our friend and Congressman, LOUIE GOHMERT says, "Why do we pay them to hate us?"

Mr. Speaker, it is absolute hypocrisy to fund this corrupt communist dictator on Monday and then complain about his antidemocratic actions on Tuesday.

Do we give money to Venezuela because we need them as a source for crude oil? If so, this is another reason we should become energy self-sufficient and not depend on Third World dictatorships for oil.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be.

NEW MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM A SUCCESS IN FLORIDA

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the very first time in American history, every senior will now have access to prescription drugs.

In my district on the gulf coast of Florida, we have seen the huge success of the program, within many of the counties over 60 percent of the seniors

signing up for the new benefit in just the first month and a half.

As my constituents know very well, one of the strongest supporters of the new Medicare prescription drug benefit has been AARP, the leading advocate for seniors in America.

Like AARP, I have long been going out into my local communities and encouraging seniors to sign up for one of the programs offered in their home area.

Just 10 days ago, I hosted a Medicare outreach bus in Spring Hill. It was there that I heard from a man named Joseph Drexler, who was able to drastically reduce his yearly prescription drug costs. Skeptical of the program when he arrived, Mr. Drexler left the help station saying this about his CMS enrollment counselor: "She deserves a medal or something."

Mr. Speaker, it is the experiences of men and women like Joseph Drexler across America that have proven the new Medicare prescription drug plan to be a rousing success.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

METHAMPHETAMINE EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, legislation to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act came before the House, and something attached to the PATRIOT Act that sometimes has escaped notice is the fact that legislation to address the methamphetamine epidemic spreading across the country was included.

This legislation provides a uniform, national standard for the regulation of precursor chemicals which are necessary to the manufacture of methamphetamine. Currently, we have a hodgepodge of State laws and regulations. This provides a national standard that is uniform and this is very important.

Key provisions are as follows: limits the amount of pseudoephedrine sales, and pseudoephedrine has to be an ingredient to make methamphetamine. They cannot do it without it.

It requires that pseudoephedrine and other precursor chemicals are sold from behind the counter. In many cases now you can go in and pick them up.

Requires purchasers of these chemicals to show I.D. and sign a logbook.

Restricts Internet sales of precursor chemicals.

So if we look at this, Mr. Speaker, we see that in 1990 there were only two States that had 20 clandestine meth labs each. California had 20 or more and Texas had 20 or more. Then you see

the spread of this epidemic. By 2004, practically the whole Nation was blanketed by small meth labs. The only exception would be in the New England States in the Northeast, and that is rapidly being taken over as well.

So this is something that is spreading rapidly. However, it is important to realize that 70 to 80 percent of the methamphetamine in the United States is now coming from super labs, mostly in Mexico, in the form of crystal meth. So these small, clandestine meth labs are no longer quite so relevant because almost all of the meth coming into the United States is coming out of Mexico.

This legislation does something that is really critical. It seeks to cripple the super lab meth production by tracking large international shipments of pseudoephedrine. As I mentioned earlier you have to have pseudoephedrine to make methamphetamine.

It requires the five largest exporting countries of pseudoephedrine and the five largest importing countries of pseudoephedrine to report and track shipments of pseudoephedrine and report to the United States. Failure to comply would lead to a reduction in U.S. foreign aid to that country by as much as 50 percent.

We think this is the best regulation we have been able to come up with yet to track the international sale of pseudoephedrine and superlab production.

Additional provisions toughen penalties against meth producers and traffickers, improves and authorizes new funding for the drug courts program, provides help to States to protect drug-endangered children.

In Nebraska in 2005, nearly 6,000 children were living in foster care situations. This is a State with only 1.7 million people. An estimated 50 percent of foster care children in Nebraska, roughly 3,000, are in the foster care system because their parents are meth users or abusers.

An Arkansas study indicates that the average meth addict costs the State and local agencies \$47,500 per year because of crimes, child and spouse abuse, incarcerations, et cetera.

One recent study indicated that a prenatal child exposed to meth can cost as much as \$250,000 in health care just for the first year alone and can cost up to \$1.7 million to get that child to age 18.

It is a hugely important problem and very stressful. I believe this legislation is a critical first step to ridding our communities of this plague, and I urge support of the conference agreement.

I would like to just show one last picture. This is a young woman who was photographed each year from 1979 until her death in January of 1989, and as you see these pictures, you see her steady deterioration and what looks like an aging process of maybe 50 years in a period of 10 years, and it culminated in her death. This is something we have to get rid of.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2320. An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3199) entitled "An Act to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes."

□ 1930

NATIONAL INTEGRATED BALLISTIC INFORMATION NETWORK PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, once again we are threatened budget cuts that affect our local law enforcement agencies' effectiveness. Not only is the COPS program facing cuts and the criminal background check system for firearm purchases underfunded, but now the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network program is also in jeopardy.

The NIBIN is used by forensic experts to analyze the unique marks made on bullets and cartridge cases when guns are fired. The images of these markings can be compared with other images in more than 200 Federal, State, and local law enforcement laboratories. By tracing and comparing these markings, police can track the history of a gun used in a crime. They can determine which crimes are related and make sure the appropriate law enforcement agencies are working together to find the criminals responsible for these crimes.

NIBIN makes law enforcement agencies more efficient by making sure that two agencies are not duplicating their work. In large part, NIBIN has been a success. Last year, the Los Angeles Police Department arrested a man for vandalism and possession of a firearm. The gun was tested and identified as being used in an attempted murder only a month before. If not for ballistics testing, this individual would have gone free and the attempted murder case would still be unsolved.

In my own State of New York, an individual was arrested for unlawful possession of a weapon. The gun was entered into the NIBIN database and was discovered to have been used in an unsolved assault with a deadly weapon incident that occurred in a different jurisdiction. Again, a violent criminal was taken off the streets because of ballistics testing. This is happening on a daily basis.

There are countless other success stories throughout our Nation; but, unfortunately, NIBIN's future is in doubt. Budget cuts are jeopardizing the future of this program. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms administers NIBIN and may be forced to cut spending unless Congress acts. Cutting funding of this great program would be a tragedy resulting in more criminals getting away with horrendous acts of violence. ATF needs more, not less, funding for this particular program.

A Department of Justice report last year said the ATF needs to better promote and improve NIBIN. Many law enforcement agencies do not participate in NIBIN simply because they do not have the resources to enter the information into the database. The Justice Department report suggests purchasing equipment for high-crime areas and developing a plan for lower-incidence areas to share ballistics technology.

The report also states it is imperative that we deal with the backlog of ballistic evidence not yet entered into the database. A similar problem exists in the National Instant Background Check system, and I have introduced legislation to give States grants to make sure that data is entered.

We must also fund new ballistic technologies that can provide matches on portions or fragments of bullets found at crime scenes. Mr. Speaker, since 9/11 our law enforcement officers have accepted new responsibilities in the war on terror. But this current budget wants to cut programs that staff local police forces and provides them with bullet-proof vests. Let us work together to make their jobs easier, not more difficult. Let us fully fund the ATF's National Integrated Ballistic Information Network. This will catch repeated offenders before they commit another crime and make sure our law enforcement agencies are on the same page when it comes to investigating crimes that have been related.

A VISIT TO AREAS AFFECTED BY HURRICANE KATRINA

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment or two to talk about the trip that we had with Speaker HASTERT and Leader PELOSI on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. With grateful thanks to Speaker HASTERT, he took us down to Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama, mainly to see the disaster areas 6 months later and what is happening in those States.

The American people, I know, tend to forget what is going on; but when you go to these States, they need our help desperately. I have been watching CNN and certainly have followed what is going on down there; but when you see it with your own eyes, it is more than anyone can ever imagine: to see whole trailer trucks just thrown into the wetlands due to force of this hurricane; to see the housing just collapsing on a daily basis; and to see our local government officials trying to make ends meet but without a budget because there are no businesses that provide a

tax base. There are no homes there. And the people certainly have to come back to bring back the communities.

In my opinion, it is up to the Federal Government. I know we are trying, but we have to do a little bit better. It is our moral responsibility to help these people. We never know when a disaster will happen in our own back yard, so I hope the American people do not forget the people of Hurricane Katrina. There is still much work to be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4808, UNFAIR CHINESE AUTOMOTIVE TARIFF EQUALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, Mr. KILDEE of Michigan, a Member of Congress, joined me in a bill, H.R. 4808, which would prevent imports of passenger cars from China until the United States and Chinese tariffs on these items are equal.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that our trade deficit with China is well over \$200 billion. We all agree that we live in a world where we have to work with each other and trade with each other. The problem is that under the current agreement, these cars that will be coming in from China put us at a disadvantage, our workers and our car companies.

Let me just share with you that if we ship a car from America to be sold in China, the Chinese Government slaps a 28 percent tariff on American-made cars. If those Chinese cars come into America, we charge them a 2.5 percent tariff on their cars. That is not a level playing field.

I think China has enough advantages, quite frankly. They manipulate their currency, violate intellectual property rights, utilize heavy equipment, government subsidies, pay their workers just pennies a day, and they do not have to worry about the labor and environmental standards that Americans must abide by. The tariffs just give China another unfair advantage, an advantage that threatens the job of every worker in the United States auto industry.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this fairness issue. That is all this is about, fairness, because our workers work hard to produce a quality product. When we send it to China, they, again, put a 28 percent tariff on our cars going to China, while we only put a 2.5 percent tariff on passenger cars coming to America.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that we fail to realize. With that \$200 billion trade deficit, in *The Wall Street Journal* this week it said: "China defends outlay to increase by 17.4 percent, the most in 4 years." The Chinese are making money off the American people, and they are taking that money and, in many cases, they are putting it into their military.

Now, I am not so concerned about China and America going to war, but I do know this: China is trying to build one of the strongest militaries we have ever seen in this world, and what they want to do is to dominate Southeast Asia.

What Mr. KILDEE and I are asking for is just a simple matter of fairness. If we are going to sell their cars, let us charge them the same tariff they are going to charge us to sell our cars in China. I would hope that my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, would join us in this effort. This, again, is nothing but an issue of fairness.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute has said that since 1989 through the year 2003 we have lost 1.5 million jobs to the Chinese. Here, again, on this floor tonight I am announcing H.R. 4808, a bill introduced by a Democrat and Republican, that says that we need to charge the same tariff for American cars going to China as Chinese cars coming to America. We should all pay the same. That is a simple matter of fairness.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I shall be speaking on this issue quite a few times, but I will tell you that we need to be aware of what is happening to the jobs that have been going overseas, and particularly those jobs going to China. So I hope tonight that my colleagues will look at the letter that is signed by Mr. KILDEE and myself asking our colleagues in the House to join us on H.R. 4808. All it is is a tariff fairness issue.

I will close by saying this again: American cars that go to China to be sold have to pay a 28 percent tariff, Chinese cars coming to America later on this year will pay only a 2.5 percent tariff. That is not fair to the American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform; to please bless their families; and, God, please continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN SEARCH OF A COMPETENT CONSERVATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week, a number of Americans were able to see the President on the videotape on Katrina and see also what has happened down in New Orleans since that time, or the lack of action there. We also witness every day the civil war that is engulfing Iraq and a policy of failure to bring stability to Iraq, the chaos that has engulfed our Medicare prescription drug plan, and also the flare-up over our port security and selling major assets of America's infrastructure to foreign countries.

In 2000, President Bush ran as a compassionate conservative. At this point, I would settle for a competent conservative. From Iraq to Medicare to port security to the deficit to Katrina, this administration has mismanaged the situation to the point where even die-hard supporters are acknowledging their incompetence. And this Congress has been a rubber stamp to the administration's policies and has refused to do its job, which is oversight, on every one of these issues.

On Iraq, we have \$10 billion out of \$480 billion totally missing. Not one hearing about what happened to the \$10 billion. Nobody has asked a single question. Nobody can account for it. We have soldiers over there without Kevlar vests, where parents are left to literally do bake sales to raise the money for their children so they can have the protection that their government and their taxpayers expect and are responsible for, yet nothing. We have literally members of the armed services running around like scrap metal collectors trying to solder their Humvees, yet nobody has asked a single question as to how that happened; why is that happening?

We have Paul Bremer, the President's ambassador, who now writes a book and says that he had asked for 500,000, or doubling the size of the troop level; yet for 3 years the President of the United States said nobody ever asked for more troops. If they want more troops, we will send more troops. General Abizaid and Paul Bremer, the President's ambassador, have said that he had asked for more troops, and neither the Secretary of Defense nor the President of the United States acknowledged that memo. Yet what do we have? Nobody is holding them accountable. Nobody is holding anyone accountable in the administration.

We have a great deal of incompetence. We are at \$480 billion in Iraq, with 2,300 Americans, our fellow citizens, having lost their lives. Well over 15,000 are wounded, permanently many of them, yet not a single question of what happened here. What is the competency here?

Now, take a look at this on Medicare. It is not just isolated to Iraq. We have now had that policy, and that policy has run its course. We now have a civil war that the American people find themselves in the middle of, between the Sunnis, the Shiites and the Kurds all fighting each other, and nobody has

asked the questions of what happened to the troops, the amount of troops, what happened to the KEVLAR vests, the Humvees; how come there are not enough men and women that the ambassador and the general had asked for.

Not a question. Nobody is responsible. Nobody ever got fired, let alone the questions about the intelligence going into it.

Take Medicare. We debated here on this floor, and I voted against that bill and said it was going to lead to great confusion to seniors. Rather than a simple plan, letting negotiations happen, letting reimportation happen, and letting generics hit the market, which all would drive the price down of prescription drugs and save money, Members here said and the administration said it will only cost \$390 billion over 10 years. Before the ink was dry, it rose to \$790 billion. So all the taxpayers are going to have to pay double what they were told and everybody in the administration knew.

One person who said, here is what the report said, was under threat of being fired if they let that information out. Yet now, with 2 years to prepare, 2 years to get ready, the Web site, run by HHS, had the information wrong. The catalogue they sent out to every senior had it wrong. It has led to massive confusion where seniors now are sometimes double enrolled, cannot get enrolled, and where States are having to step in for the poorest of the poor because they cannot get their plan. It is run like, as some people say, they couldn't run a one-car parade if they tried.

Again, that massive incompetency and the inability of this Congress to have oversight and keep people's feet to the fire and hold them accountable, to ask the questions and get the answers the American people want are not being done today.

□ 1945

And the incompetency is not isolated to Medicare or Iraq. Take the response to Hurricane Katrina: when we saw that tape, we now learn that, in fact, Mr. Brown, or known to the rest of us as Brownie, was doing a heck of a job, and he gets fired, and yet it is Chertoff who is still head of the Homeland Security Department, had no idea what was going on, no line authority, never involved himself, and we had a massive disaster.

When you run through the economy, Iraq and the deficit, what this President has done, I would settle, and I think the rest of the country would be quite happy if we had a competent conservative rather than the compassionate conservative that we were promised. The American people are not looking for a compassionate conservative, a fiscal conservative, or a social conservative. A competent conservative would do America well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING FIRST SERGEANT BRAD KASAL

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to deliver the story of an American hero, Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal, to this Chamber and to the American people.

Sergeant Kasal was born in the small town of Afton, Iowa, where he was raised on a small family farm and where he learned Midwestern values which would later serve him very well in his service in the United States Marine Corps. Sergeant Kasal is 39 years old and has served three tours of duty in Iraq and Kuwait. He is a member of Weapons Company, Third Battalion, First Marine Regiment, also known as "Thundering Third."

When you hear Sergeant Kasal's story of courage and sacrifice, it is not surprising that he comes from a solid family of patriots who have also served our country.

Brad Kasal's brother Jeff is a retired Army paratrooper who served our country in Operation Desert Storm with the 82nd Airborne and now works in Iraq. Brad's brother Kelly served in the United States Army, and his brother Kevin also served in the United States Marine Corps. And 50 years ago, their father, Gerald, served in the Iowa National Guard.

But even among the patriotic Kasal family, Sergeant Brad Kasal's experiences set him apart. During his three tours of duty in Iraq and Kuwait, Sergeant Kasal has received two Purple Hearts. His first was awarded for an incident in August 2004 for shrapnel wounds to the face, neck and shoulder from a rocket-propelled grenade.

His second Purple Heart came from events which took place on November 13, 2004, when Marines were in their fifth day of Operation Phantom Fury, which was a battle to free Fallujah from the grip of the terrorists.

Sergeant Kasal was patrolling the streets and had the duty of clearing terrorists from buildings when he saw a fellow marine wounded and leaving a building. He told him that three more of their men were still inside and under attack.

Without regard for his own life and safety, Sergeant Kasal charged into the

building to defend and rescue his men. It was then that he saw several dead Iraqis, the wounded Marines, and a terrorist confronting him with an AK-47 rifle less than 2 feet away. While he managed to dodge the bullets and kill that terrorist, another terrorist was able to sneak up behind him and open fire. Sergeant Kasal was hit by those bullets and fell to the ground. He was dizzy and disoriented from his wounds, but he immediately began caring for another wounded marine. Sergeant Kasal knew he had to stay alive to save himself and the others. As he struggled to remain conscious, a grenade dropped onto the ground next to a wounded marine.

Responding to his instinct to protect his comrade, Sergeant Kasal threw his own body over Private First Class Alexander Nicoll. Thankfully, Sergeant Kasal's helmet and body armor protected his vital organs, but he took the full brunt of shrapnel to his back, shoulders and legs. For the next 45 minutes as he lay grievously wounded, Sergeant Kasal used his 9 millimeter handgun to defend himself in a prolonged shootout where he suffered another bullet wound.

This picture shows Sergeant Kasal being helped from the building still clutching his trusty 9 millimeter handgun. He explained that he kept the gun because he was being evacuated through a kill zone where he knew a number of terrorists remained, and he feared his weapon might be needed to fend off more potential attackers.

Long after he was rescued, Sergeant Kasal learned the full extent of his injuries. Ultimately, he lost 60 percent of his blood. He took 40 pieces of shrapnel wounds, and suffered seven bullet wounds.

Despite his wounds, Sergeant Kasal said his efforts and wounds were worthwhile. The marine whom he shielded, Private Nicoll, had survived the battle.

Sergeant Kasal must undergo constant medical procedures and therapy, but his ultimate goal is to recover so he can resume his service in the Marine Corps to defend you and me and the people of our country.

Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal does not think of himself as a hero. He is a model Marine and hero for Americans.

In all wars, there are stories of bravery and heroism. The story of Marine First Sergeant Brad Kasal stands out among them. There is no doubt that Sergeant Kasal's actions on November 13, 2004, prove he is an honorable marine with a bigger passion for his fellow marines and our country than his own life and safety.

Sergeant Kasal believes the values he learned in his Iowa upbringing, as well as the strong spirit of the Marine Corps, gave him the strength and will to persevere in an otherwise unsurvivable situation.

Sergeant Kasal makes me proud to be an Iowan and an American; and I thank him for his bravery, honor, and patriotism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MILITARY DISCRIMINATES AGAINST GAYS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time of declining morale, when we are barely able to maintain a volunteer force, the sign on the Army recruiter's door might as well say: "Openly gay Americans need not apply."

Here is the military, struggling to meet its recruitment goals and in some instances even lowering its standards as a result, but still they are turning away and actively weeding out an entire group of people for no other reason than raw prejudice. How dumb is that.

But yesterday, the Supreme Court ruled that universities receiving Federal funding could not ban military recruiters from their campuses in protest over the military's discrimination against gay Americans. I am not going to relitigate that case here on the House floor, but I do think and I sincerely hope that this case can shine a national spotlight on the absolute folly of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

Because of their sexual orientation and their unwillingness to conceal it, selfless patriotic Americans are forbidden from serving their country. They cannot serve even though their skills are desperately needed, even though there are available slots, even though they are volunteering for duty that most of their peers have opted against.

How does the Army expect its people to be all they can be when it will not allow them to be who they are. What can be more un-American? Yet another example of a Nation preaching the rhetoric of freedom and self-determination around the world while undermining those very values here at home. It is a civil rights outrage to be sure.

But on a purely practical note, it is just plain bad national security policy. Is this any way to defend a Nation, by purging the military of talented and dedicated soldiers because they are unashamed of their love for members of the same sex? It is arbitrary, irrational, and dangerous.

A GAO report, released about a year ago, concluded that 10,000 Americans have received military discharges under a policy of "don't ask, don't tell" at a cost to taxpayers of roughly \$191 million.

In recent years, since the launch of wars against Afghanistan and Iraq, the military has purged several Farsi and Arabic translation specialists because they were discovered to be gay. This shocking and incomprehensible personnel decision has prompted my friend and colleague, Barney Frank, to relabel the Pentagon policy: "Don't ask, don't tell, don't translate."

How is that for a forward-looking national defense strategy? At just the moment when we need to understand Mideastern culture and win over hearts and minds of its people, the military dismisses the people who speak their language. The 9/11 Commission cited a shortage of Arabic speakers, and, thus, an inability to translate key intelligence as a handicap in our ability to predict the September 11 attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I have been outspoken in my opposition of the Iraq war and my belief that now is the time to bring our troops home. But I am antiwar, not antisoldier, not antimilitary. I want us to have the strongest possible national defense, a goal that is in no way incompatible with rooting out intolerance and protecting equal rights.

There is no trade-off, no balance of competing interests in this case. If "don't ask, don't tell" fails the social justice test and detracts from national security, what possible use could it have?

I would have thought that a 3-year \$250 billion war that is stretching the military to its breaking point would compel the Congress and the Pentagon to reexamine this block-headed policy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS INFILTRATING OUR U.S. PORTS

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, in the world we live in today, there is nothing more important than American security. This is one reason I was surprised to learn there is a plan to let a foreign government, through its government-controlled company, run major ports throughout our country, including part of the port of Beaumont in my district in southeast Texas.

We hear that the UAE ports deal will not jeopardize national security be-

cause this government company will actually help us with homeland security. My question is: Are we now going to outsource national security as well?

The recent disturbing decision to allow the United Arab Emirates to have a stake in operations in U.S. ports is a dangerous decision that defies common sense.

History has shown that friends of the United States come and go. Those who are our friends today may not be our friends tomorrow. The UAE, although alleged friends today, have not been our friends in the past; and there is nothing that proves that they will continue that friendship in the future.

The UAE recognized the Taliban. It laundered money that financed the 9/11 terrorists, and it continues to participate in the Arab boycott against our ally, Israel. This country harbored terrorists that played a role in killing 3,000 people on September 11. We cannot ignore their perilous past.

Mr. Speaker, last time I checked, we were at war against the Taliban. I find it extremely hard to believe that we would want to give a country that supported our enemies access to our ports. If this deal were to go through, these same foreign entities would have access to U.S. manifests showing what cargo is being shipped and where and when it is going. According to a recent Zogby poll taken in October 2005, it found that over 70 percent of those who live in the UAE do not even like the United States. If this arrangement goes through, who is going to stop a potential terrorist from posing as someone else, going to work for one of these ports, and gaining access to information with the intent to harm Americans? We do not need to take this risk with national security.

Currently, only 5 percent of the more than 14 million containers entering through our Nation's ports are screened. Clearly, our ports are already vulnerable. In a day and age where we are allowing 95 percent of the cargo to come and go through our ports without inspection, it is hard to believe that we are willing to give security to a foreign entity, much less one that has anything but a strong record in preventing terrorism. Even the U.S. Coast Guard, which is in charge of port security, seems uneasy about letting this take place.

Many Americans across our land are opposed to this foreign operation in our homeland. The port of Beaumont in Texas, one of the operations proposed to be run by this UAE deal, ships one-third of the military cargo going to Iraq and Afghanistan. This is more than any other U.S. port. Now we want to give a foreign government access to U.S. military shipping information? I think not.

We cannot allowed our ports to be infiltrated by foreign governments. And this is not a partisan issue; it is an issue of national security. For this reason, I have joined colleagues from across the aisle in introducing a bill

that will stop this UAE operation from going through. I have joined the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) in introducing legislation to prevent this dangerous and deceptive deal. This deal should become a "no deal" before it becomes an ordeal.

Mr. Speaker, just last week we introduced the Port Security Act of 2006. This is the House version of legislation already introduced in the Senate. This bipartisan legislation will prohibit foreign state-owned companies from controlling operations at U.S. ports and stop the UAE deal by mandating a congressional review of existing foreign state-owned companies that are operating in American ports. There is an innate and inherent problem, not to mention a serious national security risk, with letting state-owned foreign companies buy interests in American ports.

I am not opposed to foreign privately owned companies operating in our country. I understand we live in a global economy. Foreign ownership of a hotel or car company is one thing, but foreign government ownership in port operations, especially those that handle military cargo, is absurd.

There are entirely too many issues that need to be ironed out before we start offering our ports and our national security up to foreign governments for sale or for lease. This decision is unwise. It is a risky business. This ought not to be. And that is just the way it is.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS REQUEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 proposes 20 percent more military aid to Azerbaijan than to Armenia. This request is a clear breach of an agreement struck between the White House and the Congress in 2001 to maintain parity in U.S. military aid to Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, the parity agreement is unfortunately a battle that the Armenian people have had to fight in the past. The fiscal year 2005 Presidential request was similar in that it called for more military funding to Azerbaijan.

However, the Congress reversed the President to ensure military parity in the fiscal year 2005 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. After that battle and the President's 2006 budget request

that included parity, I thought the President's fiscal year 2007 budget would continue that policy. But unfortunately that was not the case. A lack of military parity would, in my opinion, weaken ongoing peace negotiations regarding Nagorno Karabakh, among other things.

It will also contribute to further instability in the region, and it undermines the role of the United States as an impartial mediator of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. Mr. Speaker, the government should not be rewarding the Government of Azerbaijan for walking away from the organization for security and cooperation in Europe's Key West peace talks, the most promising opportunity to resolve the Nagorno Karabakh conflict in nearly a decade.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the administration's budget also calls for drastic cuts in economic assistance to Armenia. I was discouraged to see that the President requested a 33 percent decrease in economic aid from \$74.4 million last year to \$50 million this year. Technical and developmental assistance and investment is essential to Armenia. This funding is key to democratic stability and economic reform in the country.

Mr. Speaker, is this the message we want to send to our friends in Armenia? Do we want to cut economic aid to a country that is terrorized by its neighbors and is shut off on its eastern and western borders due to an illegal blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan?

Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks I will advocate to the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to restore military parity, to increase economic assistance to Armenia and to provide for humanitarian aid to the people of Nagorno Karabakh. It is incredibly important to reward our allies and to send a message to Azerbaijan and Turkey that ethnically charged genocides, illegal blockades of sovereign nations, and the constant harassment of the Armenian people will not be tolerated.

AMEND THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, and I have just introduced a bill, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit the provisions of the United States military assistance and the sale, transfer or licensing of United States military equipment or technology to Ethiopia.

The bill requires that before the United States provides military equipment to the regime in Addis Ababa that our President certifies that the Government of Ethiopia is not using our equipment or assistance against prodemocracy advocates or peaceful civilian protesters in Ethiopia. Is that too much to ask?

It is an outrage that in Ethiopia that over 80 opposition leaders and human rights activists and journalists have been recently charged with treason, violent conspiracy and genocide. These prisoners of conscience face brutal captivity and the possibility of death sentences. They include 10 newly elected members of the Parliament and other officials of the opposition Coalition for Unity and Democracy Party, that is the CUD.

These brave souls face charges filed against them by a corrupt and repressive government. This same government blatantly stalled the last election, making a sham out of the democratic process. Five of those being charged with criminal behavior work for the Voice of America. One of those being held is Dr. Berhanu Nega. He is an American citizen and mayor of Ethiopia's largest city. Dr. Nega is an advocate of democracy. He faces the death penalty for his involvement in mass protests over the election fraud that took place in Ethiopia during their last election.

Now, in January, the British Government cut the equivalent of \$88 million in aid in support to Ethiopia. This was due to its concerns about the governance and human rights issues arising from this disputed election. Other international donors have taken similar measures.

My legislation requires certification by the President of the United States that our military equipment provided to Ethiopia is not being used to beat down those who would bring honest and democratic government to that troubled land. In Ethiopia, it is incumbent upon us as Americans to be on the side of those struggling for honest and democratic government, not on the side of their oppressor.

No pragmatic strategy can justify the United States backing a regime that stole the last election and has brutalized their own people and will, at some point, disintegrate from its own corruption and incompetent ways. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and supporting the democratic movement in Ethiopia, just as we did with a similar movement in Ukraine just 2 short years ago and in other countries throughout the world where the future was in play and human freedom was in the balance.

That is what being an elected representative of the American people is all about, standing for our ideals and our principles. And nowhere could that be made more clear than to stand with the people of Ethiopia, who are struggling to make a democratic government, to form a democratic government, and to have honest government and the recognition and respect for people's rights within their own country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE STATE OF HEALTH CARE: REPUBLICAN EFFORTS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I will be joined in a little bit by my friend and my colleague, Dr. PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, for this next hour. It is important that we lay out a large segment of what we believe is a critically important agenda to reform health care in America.

We know that few things are more valuable to us than the health of our families. When the health of our families is threatened, we feel frightened, we feel vulnerable, and we desperately search for help. I think few would challenge that the United States provides, as available, the best health care in the world, dedicated and caring physicians and nurses and hospitals and professionals, and we have made huge technological advances in fighting disease and prolonging life. Our research and medical technology is second to none. It significantly advances every year.

However, despite these many accomplishments, the American health care system is burdened by severe problems that lower quality and increase costs and too often make this system unaffordable and inaccessible for millions of Americans. Too many families, unfortunately, are only able to window-shop for health care coverage, and they feel as though they cannot go into the store.

Tonight, those colleagues of ours on our side of the aisle, who are part of our health care team, will be talking about a number of important issues to advance this cause. Mr. Speaker, before I go into this, let me pause, if I may, for a moment, and say usually when I have been here for Special Orders to talk about issues, I traditionally was walking up to the Capitol to make a call to my mother to let her know. She then would get on the phones and call

all her friends. My mother was a nurse, worked for many years at hospitals in Cleveland, as well as in industrial settings.

I am sad to say that since I last spoke in the Chamber, my mother had died, but I am sure she is still doing her own method of notifying her friends, and meeting my father now to talk to him and to say, make sure you pay attention to this message.

It is a message that I hope Americans will attend to as well. Because while there are those who talk about the costs of health care, what we are going to be talking about tonight is ways of changing health care and not simply shifting the burden of health care to one or the other.

Let me talk about a few of the costs that we need to pay attention to. Health care costs are skyrocketing. In 2005, the Federal Government spent over 45 percent of mandatory spending on health care programs, including almost \$300 billion for Medicare and \$181 billion for Medicaid. Medicaid costs now consume about 70 percent of States' budgets, and it is rising more than the rate of inflation. This, nearly half a trillion dollars, does not even include the billions that we spend at the Federal level in discretionary health care spending for Department of Veterans Affairs, \$31 billion; the National Institutes of Health, which has increased over 100 percent in the last 10 years under President Bush, to \$28.5 billion; the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, \$8.2 billion; the Indian Health Services, \$4 billion; Early Head Start, \$6.8 billion; and the Women, Infants and Children program, \$5.3 billion.

□ 2015

When we add to this also the costs paid for by employers and paid for by families across the Nation, the numbers are staggering.

The Federal Government has made a number of attempts over the years to deal with some of these increased costs, such things as dealing with the budget, where we try and increase copayments on prescription drugs, or we deal with premium costs in private or federally or State-funded health care programs, which have all been geared towards trying to share the costs.

This higher cost-sharing requirement, in many cases, is designed to not only reduce some of the overall costs to the Federal budget, but also to help encourage patients to change some behaviors, such as not going to expensive emergency room settings for common ailments, such as colds and flu and scrapes and bumps, but instead to see their doctor. These increased copays are usually enacted to change these behaviors, and yet we need to be doing other things in order to actually change some of the flaws in our health care system.

But let us make a point of this: whenever Congress has enacted those important issues to try and change

some behaviors and actually save money, unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office, which is there to tell us how much we are spending and give us some accurate numbers, simply is unable to do this at all.

The Congressional Budget Office can only talk about savings when more money comes out of pocket, but they cannot and are unable to talk about savings that come from trying to prevent the problems we are talking about tonight.

Since the CBO does not provide what is called dynamic scoring, a potential cost savings, the Federal Government in essence ties its own hands so we can only focus on cost sharing and not directly change efficiency and reduce errors in health care. We do not deal with the biggest drivers of these costs. We did not have a way here to look at this.

Let me give you an example. If we were to ask the Congressional Budget Office how much it costs to immunize children in America or to inoculate them with several important inoculations that they receive in their infancy and young childhood, the CBO could give us that number. But ask them what this saves, what this saves in reduced hospital visits and the other medical complications, and they simply are not able to tell you.

Ask the Federal Government CBO what treatment programs for alcohol and drug abuse save, and they cannot tell you.

Ask them what Early Head Start's medical programs save when we get children to the doctor early. They cannot tell you.

Ask also what would happen if we made our medical records system more efficient and eliminated many of the costly errors in the system. They cannot tell you.

The CBO can tell us that, in the Deficit Reduction Act passed by the House, that \$150 million was placed in there, through efforts of my office and others, in order to help hospitals in high Medicaid areas use electronic medical records in order to reduce costs. But, unfortunately, the CBO cannot tell us what those costs are.

I am going to be talking a little bit more about these costs, but first I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PHIL GINGREY, to lay out some general outlines of some other things we are going to be talking about tonight. Dr. GINGREY, a friend and colleague, who we often are on the floor together talking on these health care aspects, will lay out in general some of the things we will be talking about.

As I said, I opened up naming some of the huge cost increases in health care, but Dr. GINGREY will lay out the general plan of where we need to go to make some substantive reforms in the health care system so that we are no longer talking about cost shifting, but really talking about saving money, and, more importantly, saving lives.

I yield to Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY. Dr. MURPHY, thank you so much and thank you for starting this Special Hour and allowing me to get over, as we have a great line-up of members, I think five members, of the Republican Healthcare Public Affairs Team that we formed, with Dr. MURPHY and I cochairing that subcommittee of the Republican Conference at the beginning of this 109th Congress. We have been talking about a number of issues during the past year relating to health care, the Medicare Modernization Act, Prescription Drug part D, tort reform, which we passed in this House many times and are still laboring to finally get that into law.

But this gives us, really, a great opportunity to follow on to what our President said in the 2006 State of the Union address in regard to health care. Now, he did not spend a lot of time on health care, but what he said in just a couple of pages was significantly an important part of his address to the Nation.

This Presidency and this Republican majority are fully, fully committed to making sure that we bring health care into the 21st century and we continue to maintain the edge that we have in regard to health care. But we are not going to maintain that edge if we continue to use a 20th-century model. It is just like the radio and the television set and the computer. We have to do this. We absolutely have to do it.

Dr. MURPHY probably in his opening remarks talked a little bit about one of the issues that I want him to address in regard to electronic medical records, or health IT, if you will, information technology.

I was recently in Antarctica, and I was able to take my American Express card, actually, no, one of my bank cards, and swipe it and get U.S. dollars to buy some souvenirs. But God help me if I had been hit in the head in Antarctica by a snowball and couldn't speak to the doctors, because they wouldn't know a thing about my health care record. I know that Dr. MURPHY and others have taken a leadership role on this particular issue.

So I want to just go ahead at this point and begin allowing my colleagues to talk about some of these issues that are so hugely important. Dr. MURPHY has already made some remarks and will speak further about health IT. Dr. MURPHY is on the Energy and Commerce Committee, where the Health Subcommittee does so much work on Medicaid and other issues, as I previously have co-chaired the Healthcare Public Affairs Team.

Dr. MURPHY, I would be happy to yield back to you, or we can go to the long-term care issue and come back, whatever you would prefer.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to talk a little bit, if I may, about some of these issues about errors in hospitals.

I opened up by saying we clearly have the best health care available in America, but I would like the Speaker and others to imagine this: when you go

into a hospital or doctor's office, generally you will see filing cabinets packed with paper records of a patient's care. Now, imagine also if the patient has seen multiple doctors, there are multiple files, and probably stacked somewhere on top of those filing cabinets are reports waiting to be filed, and chances are pretty good that the records between doctors' offices are disconnected, that is, one doctor may not know what the other physicians or treatment specialists have seen. Perhaps the patient has not gone for the lab tests or consultations they have been asked to do. Perhaps they have, and those records have not been returned, x-rays have not come back over, whatever that is.

But you have a situation of voluminous paper records, oftentimes scattered within a hospital in different departments or between different offices, and that results in the likelihood that important medical records could be lost or not retrieved at that moment when someone needs to be making decisions.

Having worked in both neonatal intensive care units, pediatric units, and my own private practice as a psychologist, it was often critically important to be able to access records and review them quickly. But a simple statement one was looking for in a file that was multiple volumes and oftentimes multiple inches thick, it could take hours to retrieve critically important data.

The risk of that is that some information may be missing. The risk is that important information may be missed. One study even found that one in seven medical records was missing vital information, and this could then lead to redundant tests or misdiagnoses, redundant treatments or inappropriate treatments.

Health administration paperwork costs almost \$300 billion annually, equal to about \$1,000 per person in America, or actually 31 percent of all health care expenditures in the United States; and yet we have hospitals with 21st-century technology that can use a 64-cut CT scanner that can give us three dimensional films of patients' hearts, but we are still using an 18th-century paper system to keep track of these things.

The RAND Corporation reported that these critical errors that come from redundant, unnecessary, and missed information adds \$162 billion in health care costs per year, a huge avoidable expense. Part of our move as the Republican conference here is to make sure that we encourage and fund through incentives hospitals and doctors' offices to move towards health information technology.

Medication errors alone cost Medicare about \$29 billion in costs. Whenever we talk about cost savings in programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, it is not slashing care, it is improving care; it is not denying access to care, it is bringing access to care. And that is vitally important.

Anyone who has ever had a prescription that could not be read or the pharmacist had to call back or the patient wasn't sure if it was duplicating another medication recognizes how these errors cost the system. The best, the best doctors and the best hospitals and the best specialists have their eyes blindfolded when it comes to trying to deal with these.

In the Deficit Reduction Act, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, \$150 million was put in there for hospitals to use grants in high Medicaid populations, but throughout the Nation we see many health information technology companies emerging at hospitals and insurance companies investing billions of dollars, a critically important issue.

So next time when one goes to the doctor's office and sees the papers gone, but to see, for example, in VA hospitals now the doctor putting records on a computer, calling up x-rays on a computer, looking at CT scans and MRIs, and, yes, even watching films of surgery on their computer screen, recognize that this is part of where we need to go with 21st-century medical technology.

But also know this: the physician who did the test or radiologist who did the x-ray can immediately send it over secure and confidentially to one's physician, who can then review the record.

In fact, I have been in physicians' offices, since, unfortunately, a few months ago I had an accident in Iraq and then had a CT scan in Baghdad and an MRI done in Germany, and found that what could happen here is the records could then be spent over on computer disk to physicians in Washington, D.C. and Bethesda who could then review those and easily consult, without having to call for new tests and repeat those. It wasn't just the wording that they had of what was taking place in the medical test. They could actually see it themselves.

Repeat this story millions of times a day across America, and you can see why the RAND Corporation says we could have savings of \$160 billion; and in addition to that, when you look at the savings that comes from otherwise lost days in the workplace, another \$150 billion in savings.

Let me mention one other area that we can track with electronic medical records, and that is infection rates. A bill that I am working on to actually give incentives to hospitals and medical practices to reduce infections is critically important.

Health care-acquired infections cost the United States about \$50 billion in annual medical costs. Now, these infections are such things as staphylococcus, methacycline-resistant staphylococcus aureus, urinary tract infections, pneumonia, et cetera, where what happens is through such low-tech issues as hand-washing or cleaning equipment, because we take these things for granted so much, they are not done. Sadly, this leads to somewhere up above 75,000, some estimates

even as high as 90,000, deaths per year, so says the Center For Disease Control, and these, in many cases are preventable. Now, in some cases they are not, if someone comes in with an open wound or someone is taking immunosuppressant drugs.

But what we need to do here is actually help patients get better care. We can save massive amounts if we use Medicare and Medicaid to provide incentives and pay for performance for hospitals that reduce these.

But this is where, again, using electronic medical records helps, by having this information available that hospitals can review and pull up information and saying what is happening? Are we seeing trends within the hospital? Should we take action? Information that can come up as an immediate alert to the hospital medical staff, to medical directors and hospital personnel, hospital administrators, to say infections are now detected within the hospital, we need to take affirmative, aggressive, and thorough action to isolate and deal with this. That being the case, we can save tens of thousands of lives a year and tens of billions of dollars.

Now, we point these out because it is so critically important. I hear time and time again people misleading the American public that somehow we are trying to cut Medicare and Medicaid. That is not true.

□ 2030

What we are trying to do is improve the system. And any American family knows that whether it is your car or your house, that when you deal with using inefficient and cheap ineffective ways, you can end up paying much more because the tools you use may break or the system you are trying to use to fix the problem may actually be ineffective, and it is going to cost you more in the long run.

Doing poor health care, making wrong decisions in health care, is what is expensive. Making the right decisions in health care and making sure we have the highest quality is what lowers costs. And once and for all, we have to put these tools back into the hands of health care providers across the Nation, give them the information that is needed on every patient, every time, making sure those records are secure and so that physicians are competent and hospital personnel are competent.

Dr. David Brailer, the President's appointee to take many of these actions in the area of health information technology, and Secretary Leavitt, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, are leading the charge in some of these advances along with us in Congress.

This is something that we want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker; that in so doing, we will actually be saving tens of thousands of lives and tens of billions of dollars. These are efforts we will not yield on, because we recognize that the number of deaths

that occur per year from us having our eyes blindfolded and our hands and not being able to do the best in health care is actually more that occur in a single year than died in all of the Vietnam War.

We have the tools to do this, and we as a Republican Conference will continue to lead this Nation in moving forward to save lives and save money.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. Gingrey, to control the balance of my time.

THE STATE OF HEALTH CARE: REPUBLICAN EFFORTS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) will control the remainder of the hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Dr. Murphy, thank you so much for bringing that expertise in regard to health IT and health care quality. In fact, I wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues one of the posters in regard to this.

The Rand study that Dr. Murphy mentioned, a potential savings of \$162 billion annually by going to that system, and also at least 90,000 lives, and possibly more. I wanted to close out that portion before I call on some of my other colleagues to discuss other pertinent issues.

We do have legislation introduced from the Republican Conference to incentivize physicians, particularly small group physicians through our Tax Code, in the 179 section of the Code, to let them rapidly depreciate indeed up to \$250,000. We do this for businessmen and women currently up to \$100,000, but it is so critically important, this cost savings that I point out, that we want to make sure these physicians can afford to do this, because we need every one of them to participate in health IT.

At this point, the next issue that we wanted to talk about, and the gentlewoman from Florida, my colleague, and classmate, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE, a member of Financial Services, Homeland Security, Veterans' Affairs, a Member of the Health Care Public Affairs Team, as most of us are; in addition to that she leads the Women's Issue Team of the Republican Caucus. She wears many hats.

But tonight the gentlewoman is going to talk about long-term care. And I hope she will include a little bit about the issue of health savings accounts and how they can be rolled into that. I think the President may have mentioned that a little bit.

At this point I gladly yield to my colleague from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that Mr. GINGREY is holding these to help inform people of exactly what Congress is doing on the issue of health care. I am sure when every Member

here goes back into their district, people ask them about health care.

In my district, of course, the issue is always not only just health care for seniors, but also veterans. And Dr. Murphy was absolutely correct that the VA was the first entity to begin computerizing their records, which is the reason why a veteran can go from New York at a VA facility down to one in Florida, and virtually with a few key strokes, they pull up his or her record. That is a good way to make sure that we have continuity of care.

In Florida, of course, we have many, many nursing homes. People move to Florida, and as they age in Florida, the nursing home industry is a very, very vital part of our economy. When I was a State senator, I worked long and hard on nursing home issues. We did nursing home reform.

And one of the reasons that we did nursing home reform was because we wanted to increase the staffing and make sure that nursing homes provided the kind of quality care that we all want for our seniors who are in nursing homes. But, you know, one of the issues clearly is the cost not just for those living in a nursing home, but also for younger families who have got to care for older parents or loved ones, very often termed the sandwich generation.

You know, long-term care costs can be very, very stifling. And I agree about having them be able to roll into a medical savings account. It is certainly a very important component of what we are trying to do long term.

You know, you do not fix health care forever. The need for health care reform continues as technology improves, as we all age, and also as we take into consideration all of the new pharmaceutical products that are out there that prevent people from going into hospitals, and, many times, nursing homes.

You know, that sandwich generation I was just speaking about, they are the ones who are very often helping to care for their parents. You know, nursing home costs can be upwards of \$60,000 if a person does not have insurance. And home health care costs can sometimes reach \$20,000 a year.

When we look at the demographics, those who are 85 years of age or older are the most likely candidates for long-term care service. But age is not the only indicator. Actually people of any age with limited self-care or mobility issues are candidates as well.

For the average person over age 50, home health care can cost over \$5,800 a year. Even families who have long-term care insurance are facing hefty costs. Kind of base plan premiums run between \$564 a year for a 50-year-old, for example, to \$5,300 a year for someone who is 79.

When families can no longer cover these costs, Medicaid has to pick up the tab for those who do not have long-term care insurance. And when we look at the spending in Medicaid, one-third

nationwide of all Medicaid spending goes toward long-term care.

Moreover, two-thirds of these funds are used for institutional care, even though consumers prefer to remain in their own homes and communities. I am sure, Dr. GINGREY, that in your State as well as in my State, that they have applied for waivers, kind of all efforts possible to keep people in their own homes.

People prefer to be in their own homes, but there are times when they do need to be in long-term care. One of the bills that I recently introduced that I know many of my colleagues are on, is the Qualified Long-Term Care Fairness Act. We want to encourage people to participate in long-term care insurance.

This bill provides the same tax deduction available to those who itemize as those who do not. Currently only people who itemize on their income tax can take off the cost of long-term care insurance. This was obviously overlooked when they passed the bill, in that they only allow people who itemize.

We want to make sure that this tax deduction may be used for long-term care insurance premiums, activities of daily living, diagnostic, preventative or rehabilitation services, and certainly other services prescribed by a licensed health care practitioner.

My bill also, by the way, covers home health care expenses. By taking out a policy, it really and truly helps the family so very much. We want to make sure that this additional tax deduction can be claimed by people who take that extra care to be sure that if they need nursing home care that they have the insurance to cover it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in 2001, spending for long-term care services for persons of all ages represented 12.2 percent of all personal health care spending. This was almost \$152 billion of \$1.24 trillion spent for health care.

Congress should encourage all Americans to purchase long-term care insurance. And certainly this is but one way that we can encourage our constituents to spend that money for a long-term care policy.

If I may take a moment just of personal privilege to tell a story about a very dear gentleman that everyone thought he was my dad; he was not. He had three daughters and he cared about those daughters.

Because he lived in the same community that I did, and because we were very close, people just thought that Arne was my father. Well, let me tell you, Arne was a very, very thoughtful father, because he took out long-term care insurance.

He developed Alzheimer's, and needed to be in a long-term care facility. His wife had passed on and the progression was very, very fast. Arne passed away last year, but I can just tell the Members in the Chamber tonight and those who may be watching in the audience, that Arne's children truly appreciated

the fact that he took out that long-term care insurance. Because that way, the insurance paid for all of the time that he had to spend in the nursing home. And he was able to preserve his life's savings to leave to his children, which is really what he wanted. And he also wanted to make sure that he was not a burden on the taxpayers.

I would ask as many people as possible to consider that kind of insurance to make sure that they are cared for and that their children or whoever they want to leave the rest of their savings to, that they are also provided for. I think it is an excellent way to do it.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentlewoman would yield for a second. This is such an important item, long-term care, and the anecdotal case that you just presented to us is touching and very personal, but very real and very practical, as you point out.

And we are going to talk a little bit later about, and I point out on this chart, health savings accounts; but I think the gentlewoman would agree that the opportunity to utilize money out of a health savings account to purchase at some point, maybe not when you are 35 years old and you just had the plan and you are building it up for a couple of years, but as you mentioned, I think you said in your fifties, it probably is certainly time to start saying not only do I pay for an annual physical, and maybe a mammogram or colonoscopy out of my health savings account, but maybe I need to look very closely at purchasing long-term care insurance to protect my assets, Mr. Speaker, so that they are not all used up, as I or anybody else who suffers from some debilitating illness that lasts for a long time, in a nursing home, they have no insurance, they have exhausted all of their assets.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Florida, too, in thinking outside of the box. I think that is part of why we as Members of the Republican Conference as a health care team, want to bring to our colleagues on a regular basis that we are thinking of ways to get the job done.

We are not just sitting back and accepting the same old, same old. And your bill, and I was not aware of the specifics of it, but that allowance for someone who does not itemize to actually get a deduction for the purchase of long-term care insurance I think is a great idea.

I commend the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman. And certainly the use of any funds from a health savings account for this purpose accomplishes the same thing. It gives people a tax incentive to save, to also save and preserve their assets for the future.

And, you know, I recently, this past weekend, ran into a young man who was all of 55 years old. He was injured, and spent some time in a rehab center.

And, you know, he said to himself, you know, he did not have insurance. When he told me the cost of that rehabilitation, it was astronomical.

So, you know, we all want to believe that we are going to be as healthy tomorrow as we are today. But, that is not always the case. And I remember when I reviewed the policy with Arne, because I was a little skeptical, he was 75 when he first started looking at it, and I was amazed what it did cover and how reasonable the cost was. And, you know, I looked on every line, looking for a loophole. And it ended up being something that I did recommend to him, never realizing that a few years later he would need to have this.

So I commend the gentleman for promoting the health savings accounts and any other way that we can help seniors to better prepare for their future.

□ 2045

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing us this information on long-term care.

At this time, we have an opportunity to hear another issue discussed by my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, Representative SHELLY MOORE CAPITO. And Representative CAPITO is going to talk tonight about something that, and she knows the numbers, she has been here a little longer than I have in regard to how many times we have addressed this issue of tort reform, of trying to level the playing field. Not take away anybody's rights to a redress of grievances if somebody has injured them by practicing medicine below the standard of care. That could be the provider of the care, it could be the physician, or the hospital.

In any regard, at this point I would like to turn the program over to Representative CAPITO and have her talk to us about the issue of medical liability reform.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee, not only for talking about issues that are important to us but his service on the Rules Committee as well. And also the fact that we are taking this time to talk about an issue that is probably the most-talked about issue in my district and that is health care in a general sense, but in a broader sense health care for our future.

I come from the State of West Virginia, and I think this is a great topic for somebody from West Virginia to speak on. We have passed out of the House medical liability reform I think in excess of seven times and I have lost count. I do not know exactly. But I would like to talk a little bit about what happened in the State of West Virginia and how that legislature there and the Governor there joined together to answer a desperate cry from a lot of West Virginians.

In the summer of, I think it was, 2002, the only trauma center in the largest metropolitan area of our State, CAMC

Trauma Center, closed because they were unable to staff the trauma center because people of the specialty and the hospital were having difficulty meeting the high cost of medical liability insurance. They could not get it. That traumatized our area. We live in a rural State; but this area, Charleston, was the magnet for all of southern West Virginia and eastern and western sides to come in case of a high-level trauma.

During this time, a young boy of 4 or 5 years old got a penny stuck in his throat, and he lived about 10 minutes away from the trauma center, but the trauma center was not there. It was not open. So his parents, along with their physician, had to take him to Cincinnati, Ohio, to have this extracted from his windpipe. It had a happy ending. He was fine, but if they had not had to take that amount of time to go to Cincinnati to have the work performed, I do not know what would have happened to this young boy.

Throughout 2002, I met more constituents who were telling me that their doctors, even though they were not old retirement-age doctors, middle age, in their fifties, in the peak of their profession, were moving. They were moving to other States. They were retiring out of the practice of medicine and into administration because they absolutely could not afford to continue practice. We were losing our specialty physicians. I know there is a problem nationwide with neurosurgeons, certainly orthopedists, OB-GYNs are one of the highest problem areas, and it was just cascading across our State.

We are known in our State as being one of the best places for trial lawyers to set up shop. We are very, what do I want to say, generous and we have a very good litigious society.

Mr. GINGREY. We like to use the expression in those situations: "it is easier to sue your doctor than it is to see your doctor."

Mrs. CAPITO. Right and we were reaching that point in West Virginia. We had our doctors leaving.

Another thing, I spent Sunday night with a group of physicians here in Washington, D.C., and one of the things they told me repeatedly, no matter what State they were practicing in, is that more and more they have got to practice defensive medicine. Are you going to do the MRI, Doctor?

And even though they do not think it is called for, it is not medically necessary, they go ahead and do it because if they do not do it, there is that small fraction of a chance that something might have shown up or that they could come back and be sued because they did not proceed with a procedure that they did not feel was medically necessary.

And what happens when you practice defensive medicine? The cost goes up and up and up. And this was happening in West Virginia. Again, our large medical centers, we could not recruit our doctors. We would have residencies

throughout our State and as soon as the physicians were trained, educated, and ready to practice, they would leave the State. And this was really very difficult because the word was out across the Nation: West Virginia, if you want to practice medicine, do not go to West Virginia.

So we had all of this coupled with just the out-of-control lawyer compensation that this breeds, this medical liability breeds.

So we had this kind of situation in West Virginia and what happened? It was not the doctors. It was not the hospitals. It was not the health professionals. It was the everyday citizen in West Virginia coming to policy-makers, coming to their State legislators, coming to their Governor, coming to their Congresspeople and saying, you have got to do something. You have got to pass something. And by golly, in the State of West Virginia they have passed one of the leading, cutting-edge medical liability bills that exists now in any States in the Union.

And what has happened? Confidence is back in the health professions, more specialties are being recruited into our State. And just today I had a young man in my office who was just finishing his residency at Lexington, Kentucky. He said, I am coming home to West Virginia because that is where I want to raise my family and practice medicine.

So medical liability does work. It does go to providing higher-quality care, refreshing your physician and health profession supply. It does go to bringing about an era of confidence that good-quality health care is going to be there for you. And so I would say in terms of, I know Dr. Gingrey has introduced the HEALTH Act again, and we are hoping that we will pass it out of the House of Representatives again, we will do that because we know it is important. But more and more what is happening in West Virginia is happening in other States across the Nation. And they are hearing from their everyday citizens, their folks who want to see their doctor when they want to see them, the doctor they have seen their whole life. And this is an extremely important issue to have before the American public.

The problem has been we have passed it here, and we have not heard anything more about it. It had faded out there across the Hall. I think the stronger the voices are at the local level, just like they were in West Virginia where we did not think it could ever be done, the stronger those voices are, the more optimism we can have, we can meet the demands of a good and solid medical liability reform bill.

I want to join with my colleagues here on the Health Affairs Team who think it is something we need to talk about quite a bit.

If I could take just 2 more minutes here to talk about another health issue that is extremely important to me, and that is the prescription drug bill for

seniors. It is something I worked on, and it is probably the number one issue as I have moved across the State over the last 5 years.

I was sitting in a dinner the other night after reading all the political rhetoric about the prescription drug bill and how it does not serve people, and actually one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle in my own State called it a national disaster. I sat down next to a gentleman. He said, I want to talk to you about the prescription drug bill. I almost thought I had to put a helmet on to hear what he had to say. I said, What is that? He said, I am going to save \$4,000 this year. Thank you, Congresswoman, for passing that. Thank you for providing that first-time availability of a prescription drug bill through Medicare.

I want those who are watching to know this is an extremely revolutionary bill and an availability of a prescription drug bill for our seniors.

Doctor, I would like to yield back my time to you. I appreciate your efforts in this area, and I join with you in seeing that we get that medical liability reform bill passed once again.

Mr. GINGREY. Thank you. As you point out, it could be seven times. We had passed it just last year, and I guess we will have to do it again this year maybe for the eighth time.

I just have got a little poster here, Mr. Speaker, that I want to call my colleagues' attention to here. The gentlewoman from West Virginia talked about it a little bit in regard to these issues of the need for tort reform, the cost factor, Federal outlays for health care on the rise. Yes, indeed. Nearly one-third of all Federal spending goes towards health care. And that is what she is talking about.

A lot of this spending is defensive medicine. It is unnecessary. She is talking about the trauma center in West Virginia that had to close because they could not get coverage. They could not get the neurosurgeon to take the liability or a thoracic surgeon to see that youngster with the penny lodged in his windpipe.

These are the issues; and, yes, everybody that comes into the emergency room anywhere in the country with a headache, doctors know physical diagnosis and ability to examine by looking in the eyes and checking the blood pressure. But they are not sending that patient home with a couple of aspirins and careful instructions to call the next day. They get a CAT scan and the most expensive one that is coming along for that particular year.

She did such a great job. Finally, in her last two minutes and I am so glad that she did that in regard to the Medicare Prescription Drug Act, part D. We have heard all of these naysayers. I am sure they were out there in 1965 when we had the optional Medicare part B which 98 percent of seniors are paying upwards of \$90 a month to be part of because it is a good program. This is a good program.

I thank Representative SHELLY MOORE CAPITO for giving us some information, personal anecdotal statistics from West Virginia. It is absolutely true.

At this point it is a pleasure to have as part of our team tonight, and actually my co-chair of the Policy Committee, the Republican Policy Committee on HealthCare Reform, another physician, a freshman who does not seem like a freshman because of his knowledge and skill and ability. I am talking about the gentleman, Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY, cardio-thoracic surgeon from Lake Charles, Louisiana.

Before I yield him most of the remaining time in this special hour, I want to thank him for the work that he did on the gulf coast during not only Hurricane Katrina but Rita that hit his area, his district, and devastated over 125 miles of that great part of our country and what he has tried to do in regard to going forward to work on issues, like making sure in a catastrophe like that in the future that we would have a data bank of physicians by specialty so that we would be much more organized and could respond like he did, personally, in an efficient fashion.

So at this point it is indeed a pleasure to call on the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative BOUSTANY. He will talk a little bit about competition in health care and some of the hallmarks for reform.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend and colleague from Georgia for yielding time to me. Also, I thank him for putting on this program this evening. It is very important that we inform the American public about these issues in health care.

It is undeniable that the United States has the finest health care system in the world, and I have seen it firsthand as a cardio-thoracic surgeon. I have had the great privilege of saving many lives in the practice of cardio-thoracic surgery. At the same time, I also learned firsthand about the difficulties that families go through and the high cost of health care incurred by families and small businesses.

Particularly, when my son was involved in a terrible car accident that required months of hospital care and the stress it put on my family and the financial pressure really awakened me to many of the problems that we have in our health care system. So I come here with strong determination to try to do something to help American families with the ever-rising cost and burden of providing health care.

Health care costs have doubled between 1993 and 2004, growing to nearly \$1.9 trillion and representing 16 percent of the United States gross domestic product. When you look at health care, we have to make sure that it is affordable, it is available and accessible because I commonly say, I often say back at home, All health care is local. What good is health care if you cannot access it and get it where it is affordable

where you live? That is where you need it. It does not do you any good if it is available in New York or Boston if you cannot get it at home in Lafayette, Louisiana.

So with this unsustainable rise in cost, we have got to do something to bring the cost down and make it more affordable and available. Competition is the key.

I think there are three words that really describe the principles for health care reform: information, choice, and control.

□ 2100

First of all, with regard to information, we need a free flow of information about prices, about cost to families, about cost of hospital care, cost when you go to see the doctor, the cost you incur when you go.

We also need a free flow of information about quality and outcomes, because if we have this flow of information, and information technology was mentioned earlier this evening, information technology is a critical part in providing this kind of information to the consumer and to ultimately the patient, to the family.

I often say what good is it if you do not have this information. If I go to the store to buy soft drinks or sodas for my family, I can go down the aisle, and there is a wide range of products, different quality, different flavors, different prices, and I make an informed decision. But in health care, we cannot do that. So we need information.

Choices, that is the other one. If we had a wide range of choices in health care, wide range of insurance products, then we could create this competition that will bring the cost down. It is one of the things we hope to see in the Medicare prescription Part D program, where we create competition to drive the cost of pharmaceuticals down for our seniors in these plans.

Another way of providing choice is certainly the health savings accounts that were mentioned earlier, associated health plans which is something we passed in the House. And there is also a bill that I am a proud cosponsor of; this is a bill by Representative SHAD-EGG, H.R. 2355, the Health Care Choice Act of 2005, which will allow people to shop for insurance products, health care insurance, across State lines, again creating more competition and hopefully bringing the cost down.

The final piece of this is control. We do not have portability and control. I want to put health care destiny back in the control of families and individuals because I believe by doing so we create true portability in health care, and if we do this, then we will solve a lot of the problems. We will free up our businesses, let them do what they do best, by providing work and wages and so forth, but let us let families have that portability in health care.

Those are the keys to health care reform. It is important to recognize, if you look at our health care system, 45

percent of all health care spending is in the form of Medicare and Medicaid and other Federal programs. Fifty-five percent of it is in the so-called private sector, and yet what we have is a price control system where everything is set by basically paying at the Medicare rates, which creates some degree of rationing in health care. Yet, on the other side of the coin, when you look at what is happening to providers, providers are having to deal with the free ranging, inflated cost of supplies, pharmaceuticals, surgical equipment, and this has created major distortions in our health care system. This also needs to be addressed.

So, again, if we can create competition by using those three principles I mentioned, then I believe we can truly start to bring the costs down in health care and make it more affordable, available and accessible for American families.

I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding to me, and I appreciate this opportunity to comment on health care.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank Mr. BOUSTANY so much for being with us this evening and for pointing out the rising cost of health care and what we need to do about it. I particularly appreciate what you said about transparency.

In the final few minutes, I am going to talk a little bit about the health savings accounts that the President has promoted and increased the amount of money that can be put aside, very much like an IRA, but this would be an IRA for health care. Because you are absolutely right; we use the expression, and maybe it is really apropos for health care, skinning the game. They are going to be better consumers. People do a great job shopping for an automobile or an appliance or new flat-screen television set, and they may go to eight different stores, discount big box stores, trying to save an extra fifty bucks on a plasma TV. And people do that, and I do not blame them. We can do that in health care, too.

I think Mr. BOUSTANY is absolutely right. There will be a day when we do have electronic medical records throughout the system. Secretary Leavitt is totally committed to this, and Dr. Brailer, as our good friend Mr. MURPHY said at the outset of the hour, but will also need to be done as everybody is interconnected, every medical office, every clinic, whether it is the size of Mayo or Rochester or whatever, or maybe just a two-doctor shop, everybody's information about their patients is interconnected so that we know what their needs are and also the information that physicians, their pricing information, what does an OB/GYN typically charge for a routine hysterectomy or delivery or cesarean section; what does a vascular surgeon charge for the procedures that they do. We call those endarterectomies, put in a graft to go around a blocked vessel. What does a general surgeon charge to

take out a gallbladder through laparoscopic, or appendix or thyroid? There are more than one good doctor in each community. I do not know about cardiothoracic surgeons. They are in short supply, but there are lots of us OB/GYNs and general surgeons that do a good job.

People will one day in the near future, because of what we are doing, the efforts of this Republican majority and this President, who is totally committed to making sure that we continue to have the best health care system in the world, we will see the day that in a secure environment, people can look on a Web site and know exactly what the differences are and shop economically for not the cheapest health care but the best-priced health care and good health care.

We talked a little bit at the outset of the health savings account issue. I think that this is a wonderful opportunity. I wanted to show maybe one last poster in regard to that, because we hear a lot of criticism sometimes here on the floor of this Chamber, and sometimes out in the halls and maybe indeed sometimes back home in our districts, say, oh, you know, the health savings account, they are just, here again, something for the rich, and you Republicans only care about the people that have lots of money. Well, look, Mr. Speaker, at this health savings account, not just for the healthy and wealthy.

Seventy-three percent of those who have established, and there are about 3 million now and we predict within the next couple of years 10 million, and it is growing rapidly, 73 percent have families with children. Fifty-seven percent of these holding health savings accounts are over age 40; 35 percent are from households with four or more people; 40 percent are high school graduates or have technical school training as the highest level of education. Also, I might say parenthetically, some of these folks are the most successful because they are hardworking and work by the sweat of their brow; 40 percent did not indicate any prior coverage.

So this is something for everything, and for those who do not want that, the President has talked about refundable tax credits to purchase health insurance for an individual. When I say refundable tax credits, I mean somebody that, because they are a lower economic earner and they do not typically pay taxes, they do not get any advantage from a deduction. So we actually give them money. A refundable tax credit means you give them money for the sole purpose of purchasing health insurance. These are some of the things that we wanted to talk about.

The gentleman from Louisiana, I would be glad to yield to him for a comment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also point out another feature of health savings accounts and it is something very important to think about;

and that is, as we get a large part of our generation to sign on to these health savings accounts, as our generation moves up into the Medicare years, that money will accrue and could be used for health care costs incurred at that time. It will help take some of the burden off the Medicare system in the future potentially. So it is a good, good feature as we look at these. Again, it helps the individual, it helps the family to control their own health care destiny.

So I just wanted to point that out, in addition to these very good facts that you pointed out as well.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and just in the closing minutes, I would say that also it is important for people to know that while people maintain these health savings accounts and add to them each year, they enjoy the miracle of compound interest as these accounts grow. They can only be spent on health care, but typical insurance does not cover dental care or a lot of eye care. It certainly will not pay for a hearing aid, no cosmetic surgery. It does not help women who have infertility problems who need assisted reproductive technology so they can achieve the wonderful joy of childbirth and raising a child or children. All of those things can be paid for out of these health savings accounts.

We talked about purchasing long-term health care insurance, and when a person turns 65, they can actually use some of this money for other things.

Well, that wraps it up. I see my time is drawing to a conclusion. I think the Speaker has tapped that gavel a little bit, and I do not want to cut into my good friend's, the gentleman from Georgia on the Democratic side, and his special hour. So at that we will conclude.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives this evening as a member of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, a group of 37 fiscally conservative Democrats who are outraged, absolutely appalled by these record deficits, record debt and the lack of common sense and fiscal discipline that we are seeing in our Nation's government these days.

I come to the floor and raise these issues not out of partisan politics because, Mr. Speaker, I do not know about you, but I am sick and tired of all the partisan bickering that goes on at our Nation's Capitol. It does not matter to me if it is a Republican idea or Democrat idea. My people back home want a commonsense idea, the kind of ideas that make sense for them in their everyday lives.

So I raise these issues, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly because I am concerned about the future of our country.

As you walk the halls of Congress, it is easy to spot one of the Blue Dog Coalition Members' offices, because we all have this poster beside our front door. Today, the U.S. national debt, just as I got ready to come up here this evening, the U.S. national debt is \$8,270,909,436,190. For every man, woman and child in America, including those being born as we speak, the amount of money that each person in America shares in the national debt is \$27,000 and some change.

It is hard now, Mr. Speaker, to believe that from 1998 through 2001, our Nation for the first time in 40 years had a balanced budget; and yet, this administration, this Republican Congress, has given us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history for what amounts to 6 years in a row.

This is the budget that the President of the United States has presented to Congress. It is always presented under a lot of fanfare; a lot of publicity surrounds this budget. This budget for fiscal year 2007 totals \$2.8 trillion, but what is alarming about it is that the deficit totals \$423 billion.

If that is not disturbing enough, Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we spend about a half a billion a day simply paying interest on the debt we already have, and on top of that, our national debt is increasing to the tune of about \$1 billion a day. Our Nation is spending about \$1 billion more a day than it is taking in; \$260 million a day going to Iraq, \$33 million a day going to Afghanistan, and a whole lot more going not to fund programs that matter to people because there are record cuts in this budget.

Just yesterday in Booneville, Arkansas, I was at the Dale Bumpers Research Center, one of 26 agriculture research centers that are not being cut, but being eliminated, under the President's budget for fiscal year 2007. Only in America can the President give us a budget that cuts the programs that matter to people, Medicaid, Medicare, veterans benefits, agricultural programs, and also give us the largest deficit ever in our Nation's history at the same time.

□ 2115

So as an American, I rise this evening out of concern. As a small business owner, I rise this evening out of concern about these record debts and these record deficits. And at the end of this hour, Mr. Speaker, we will change this number to show how much the national debt has risen just in the hour we have been on the floor this evening trying to talk about accountability and fiscal responsibility.

The numbers I have presented to you are bad enough. Lord knows we don't need to make them any worse. They are already the largest budget deficits in our Nation's history that this Republican leadership has given us, but

what we have recently learned is, actually, when you look at America, the way that America requires corporations to look at accounting, the deficit is even worse than what we thought.

At this time I would call on the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), the co-chair for policy in the Blue Dog Coalition, who has helped discover this little-known publication, which is very, very disturbing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend from Arkansas, and I appreciate his yielding to me. I am about to say something that very few people in America know. Hardly anyone in Congress knows it. This is not a partisan comment. I am about to reveal a document printed by this administration that received less distribution than the secret NSA domestic wiretapping activities of the administration.

This is a document that coincidentally was revealed sometime close to Christmas Eve last December. It is a document that was issued without a press release. There was no press notification about this at all. Instead of being like the budget that my friend from Arkansas showed, that was distributed to every Congressman, every Senator's office, with great fanfare, this document was distributed to fewer than 20 Members of the House and Senate. It probably went to about a dozen. It was mailed in. It was not noticed, apparently, by anyone.

And what does the document reveal? Well, first of all, this is it. When I called the Department of the Treasury, they laughed when I asked for multiple copies. This is the Financial Report of the United States Government 2005. This is the closest thing our Nation has to an annual report. Most Americans are familiar with those. All public companies are required to issue an annual report so that the shareholders can find out how the company is doing. Well, this is the annual report for America, and yet it was hidden in plain sight. Hardly anyone knows about this document.

The first page is signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow, and the first page reveals a pretty shocking fact. It reveals the fact that for all that Mike Ross was talking about, about our terrible debt and deficit situation, situations that are driving up interest rates and putting a terrible debt burden on the backs of our kids and grandkids, according to that green document my colleague from Arkansas held up, the deficit last year was \$319 billion. That is a lot of money. That is "b" for billion, or "b" as in, boy, that is a lot of money. Well, guess what this document shows on its first page, signed by Secretary of the Treasury John Snow? The real deficit last year for 2005 was not \$319 billion, it was, get this, \$760 billion.

So there are two big questions here. Why did the administration try to hide this from Congress and the American people? Why was there no press re-

lease? Why did it receive minimal distribution? And, second, why is the Secretary of the Treasury so heavily at odds with another part of the administration, the Office of Management and Budget and the director there, John Bolton? How could one gentleman say that the deficit was \$319 billion last year and another gentleman say it was \$760 billion?

Well, the difference is this: the budget of the United States uses what is called cash accounting, and only the tiniest businesses in America are even allowed to use cash accounting. Why? Because it gives you a very distorted picture of a business or of a government. This annual report for America, the financial report signed by Secretary of the Treasury Snow, uses real accounting. It is called accrual accounting, and it keeps the books in a much more accurate way.

So I think most Americans would be shocked, as my colleague from Arkansas knows, that the U.S. Government, Uncle Sam, is keeping two sets of books. One has relatively good news, the other has terrible news in it. And guess what, they are trying to hide the second set of books from the American people.

I would encourage people to go to the Blue Dog Web site. We can allow you to download this document, or you can go to the U.S. Treasury Web site and download the document. It will not be obvious, though, on the Treasury Web site. It is pretty well hidden on that Web site. It is pretty clear on the Blue Dog.com Web site. So I would encourage people to check this out and see what it says in cold hard print and ask the logical question of why the President's budget is so radically and totally different from the document issued by his own Treasury Department.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding to me.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing this to the attention of America, the "Financial Report of the United States Government for 2005," printed by our government, signed by our President's appointed Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow.

And as the gentleman from Tennessee has explained quite well, when our government says we have a \$319 billion deficit for 2005, that is based on a form of accounting known as a cash-basis form of accounting. Now, I am a small business owner; and as a small business owner, our government does not allow me to base my business on a cash-basis form of accounting. I am required by our government to use an accrual-based form of accounting. And if I do not, I am in a lot of trouble with the IRS and will probably end up in jail.

However, our government, when we talk about the budget and the debt and the deficit and we talk about it in terms of this \$319 billion, we find in this publication, the "Financial Report

of the United States of America for 2005," that it does not use a cash-basis form of accounting. It uses an accrual-basis form of accounting, and we know this only because the government, by law, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to print this document. He does not print tens of thousands of copies the way he does the budget. Only a handful are printed because they do not want the taxpayers of this country to know what is really going on here.

The truth is this: when we look at our government, the way our government requires businesses to report their dealings with the IRS, our deficit was not \$319 billion in 2005. Again, there is no reason for us to try to make these numbers any worse than they already are. They are already as bad as they have ever been in the history of our country. And these are not our numbers. These are numbers from the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow. The deficit for 2005 was not \$319 billion when using the accrual-basis form of accounting; it was \$760 billion. That is a difference of \$441 billion.

Now, John Snow, Secretary of the Treasury, in this report said: "Including these future financial responsibilities in this report gives a more complete and long-range look at the government's finances." That is the Secretary of the Treasury, appointed by President Bush. That is John Snow, in his words, which can be found on page 1 of this report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield once again to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because there are probably some listeners who are confused about cash-basis accounting versus accrual accounting. The simplest way to explain it is this way. If you were to look at giant U.S. companies like General Motors or Ford, they would be just fine today if you look at them on a cash basis because they are generating cash. But if you look at them on a more accurate basis, the way the stock market does and the way investors do, you will see that a cash basis ignores future obligations. For example, for retirees, for health care, for other benefits and obligations that should be kept and that have to be acknowledged.

That is what accrual accounting does. And lest people be confused, accrual accounting is not cruel, the way it may sound. Accrual accounting is actually the most compassionate form of accounting, because cash-basis accounting forgets the retirees and the sick. Accrual accounting remembers them. And it is vital we remember all of our retirees and our sick because their health benefits matter, and we have to take them into account in this country.

I know the gentleman is about to show the rule for business. This is a tough rule, and I look forward to the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. ROSS. Well, every business in this country is required to use the accrual method if the business has inventory, if the business is a C corporation,

or if gross annual sales exceed \$5 million. So for any corporation, any business that meets one of these criteria, our government says you must use the accrual method of accounting.

Our own government, however, though requiring businesses to use the accrual method of accounting or you go to jail and get in a lot of trouble with the IRS, that is what the government says to businesses, but the government says, well, that makes us look like we are being even more fiscally irresponsible than we want, so we will not use this accrual business. We will go back and trick the taxpayers by using the cash basis of accounting.

At this time, I want to recognize a real leader within the Blue Dog Coalition, my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It is great to be with you, Mr. ROSS, and with my colleagues from the Blue Dogs and our distinguished cochairman.

I think this startling information that you have just made known to the American people speaks to the fundamental issue at hand, and it is, in one word, security. Financial security. We cannot have national security if we do not have financial security. We cannot even have homeland security if we do not have financial security or health care security. Whatever our security is, it is anchored in financial security.

With security comes the word "confidence," and you have just shattered that realization by bringing this information to the forefront and revealing how badly we need to restore the confidence of the American people for this government's ability to handle their financial security.

But I will tell you something that really adds and complements what you have brought to the American people tonight, because I have a bit of information that ought to be startling as well. As we look at this report, as we basically see firsthand that the books have been cooked, so to speak, by this revealing document, which almost doubles the \$319 billion deficit, because now we know it is \$760 billion deficit by the words of the Treasury Secretary, but let me add this to this important discussion we are having this evening.

I do not believe the American people know that this President, President Bush, has borrowed more money from foreign governments in his 5 years than all of the preceding 42 Presidents in the history of this country.

□ 2130

I know the American people are shaking their heads and asking, is he saying what I think he is saying? Let me repeat it.

President Bush has borrowed more money from foreign governments in his 5 years, since 2000, since he first took office, than all of the preceding 42 Presidents from 1789 to 2000, 211 years. Here are the figures. From 1789 to the year 2000 of our Nation's history, 42 U.S. Presidents borrowed a combined

\$1.01 trillion from foreign governments and foreign financial institutions, according to the Treasury Department.

And now, just in the last 5 years, President Bush has borrowed a staggering \$1.05 trillion, larger than the total from all the previous 42 Presidents. If that does not tell you we have a crisis here, I do not know what does. And you combine that with this information that our co-chairman has brought to us about how the books were cooked; and, in fact, according to the more accurate accounting procedure, it is more than \$760 billion.

It is remarkable. It is phenomenal. The American people deserve the truth. We have got to give it to them because, as the Bible says, you should know the truth. It is the truth that will set you free. We are going to set America free tonight.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for his knowledgeable input about this debt and deficit and budget process. I might add, in defense of the President, the President, during his tenure in office, it is true that he has borrowed more money from foreign central banks and foreign investors than the previous 42 Presidents combined. But in fairness to the President, he could not do that alone. It took this Republican majority in this Congress to give him a budget to allow him to continue to raise the debt limit to allow him to borrow more money in the last 5 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined.

I think the American people are starting to get it at the youngest of ages. My teenage daughter was reading the paper today and she sent me an e-mail, and I will just read to you what my teenage daughter said after reading the paper this morning. She wrote, "I read that they are wanting to increase the limit of the debt. Please do not let them do this. Make them start paying it back." That is a message from a 17-year-old junior in high school who is concerned about the reckless spending, the fiscal irresponsibility going on in our government because it is her generation, it is our children and grandchildren's generation that gets saddled with these bills.

I encourage folks every Tuesday night, as members of the Blue Dog Coalition, we are here on the floor talking about fiscal responsibility and about our ideas to balance the budget. We have a 12-point plan for meaningful budget reform that will allow us to have a balanced budget and allow us to get our fiscal house in order.

For folks that are interested in e-mailing us their thoughts, opinions or questions, I encourage them to do so at BlueDog@mail.house.gov. We are the Blue Dog Coalition, 37 members strong, fiscally conservative Democrats that are here to hold this Republican Congress responsible for a record deficit and a record debt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, let me say amen to my friend's comments from Georgia. That was outstanding.

I have the pleasure of serving on the Budget Committee and this week, probably on Thursday, we will start marking up the budget for the United States of America. That is one of the most serious responsibilities that we could ever undertake. It is an incredibly complex document and process. You are talking about \$2.7 trillion. You are talking about not only all the defense programs, you are talking about Social Security and Medicare and a world of other programs, parks, agriculture, you name it; everything that the Federal Government is involved in.

In the span of a few short hours, we will be able to offer a few amendments, and we try to do this on a bipartisan basis. It is hard, but let me report on what happened last year in last year's markup.

I offered a number of the Blue Dog amendments as part of our 12-point plan for reform. They were individual, commonsense measures such as, for example, getting a cost estimate on every bill here so we know the cost of what we are voting on; having a recorded vote so that the members of this body go on record when large amounts of money are spent. We were one of the first groups in the country to go ahead and require transparency for earmarks so the public, everyone, would know what individual spending items were being requested. But probably, most importantly, we favored domestic spending caps so budget spending could not keep going up and up, and a pay-as-you-go approach so expansion of government was paid for, so that this generation paid our obligations, so we did not saddle future generations, including our men and women in uniform, with these terribly burdensome debts.

I offered that last year in the Budget Committee markup. My amendment passed on a 19-17 vote because four brave Republicans were willing to cross over and endorse a commonsense measure like that. But then the chairman of the committee realized that common sense had prevailed, and he leaned over and twisted the arm of a freshman Member of Congress and forced that gentleman to change his vote right in front of everybody. So then it was not a 19-17 victory for our side and common sense, suddenly it turned into an 18-18 tie, and, under the rules of the committee, you lose on a tie vote.

That was as close as we came last year to getting some of these commonsense principles involved. Even most State legislatures have rules like the ones I am describing. Most Americans would be outraged to learn we do not have these rules here.

We are going to try a similar approach on Thursday. I hope we prevail, and I hope Americans will tune in to see what happens, because we do try to work on a bipartisan basis. The Blue Dogs are Democrats and we are proud of that, but we reach across the aisle.

In fact, tonight, most of the Special Order is devoted to revealing the Republicans' Treasury report, because they did not want it to get the publicity that it deserves. This is one of the most important documents of government, and I have yet to meet another Member of Congress who knew about the existence of this document. It has been required by law to be published for over a decade now. Senator John Glenn of Ohio was the first person to author a bill to get this done. The former Secretary of Treasury, Bob Rubin, and the Clinton administration, championed this document. Back then the news was good. We were headed toward surpluses, and we achieved surpluses. But in the last 5 years, this document has been buried deep underground. I think it is high time we brought it above surface.

Mr. ROSS. I appreciate the co-chair for policy of the Blue Dog Coalition and a very important member of the Budget Committee bringing to the taxpayers' attention this little-known document, the financial report of the United States Government. Again, our debt is \$8,270,909,436,190.

Now, as members of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, we do not come here on Tuesday nights to simply complain about how this Congress is out of control with its spending without also offering a solution. As the gentlemen from Tennessee and Georgia mentioned, we have a 12-point reform plan to cure our Nation's addiction to deficit spending. And I can tell you, one of the problems that taxpayers in this country have with this debt and with these deficits is the lack of accountability. I want to talk about that for a moment.

Some of you have heard this before and I am going to continue to talk about it until every one of these 11,000 fully furnished, brand new manufactured homes sitting in a pasture in Hope, Arkansas, get to the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

Mr. COOPER. Are those the famous FEMA trailers?

Mr. ROSS. Those are the FEMA trailers. FEMA has spent an estimated \$431 million of our tax money purchasing some 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes.

Mr. COOPER. Who is living in those homes?

Mr. ROSS. Nobody. Here is the story. FEMA shows up in Hope, Arkansas, my hometown. I now live 16 miles down the road in Prescott, Arkansas. They show up at city hall and say, we understand you have these inactive runways as a result of World War II. We want to use them as a so-called FEMA staging area.

The idea was these manufactured homes were going to come into Hope and then go to the people who lost their homes and everything they owned as a result of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. They started coming. They started coming in October, and they came and they came, but they never went.

So as a result of that, 25 percent of them now sit on these inactive, closed military runways, and 75 percent of them are sitting in a cow pasture. That is 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes sitting in a pasture in Hope, Arkansas, and FEMA owns them, they have already bought them. And FEMA at the same time is spending our tax money to provide housing in hotels and motels for some 12,000 storm victims.

If that is not enough, we all know about the tent city that is set up near Pass Christian, Mississippi, where families in the winter are living in a tent while FEMA has 11,000 brand new, fully furnished manufactured homes sitting in a cow pasture in Hope, Arkansas. That is an aerial photo of some of the 11,000. There is the barbed-wire fence, and there are the manufactured homes. Most of them are 14 feet wide, 60 feet long. Some are 80 feet wide. And now that the drought is about to end and the rains are starting to set in, I do not have to tell you that they are going to be sinking. They are going to be sinking. They are going to be damaged.

What is FEMA's response? Oh, no, not to get them to the people that need them, the people living in hotels and motels and tents 6 months after the storm. Their response is we are going to spend \$6-8 million graveling this 290-acre cow pasture so we can store these manufactured homes for a future disaster. FEMA refuses to move these manufactured homes into a flood zone.

Normally I would say that makes sense, but the reality is in this instance, everybody that lost their home as a result of Hurricane Katrina lost their home because they lived in a flood zone. FEMA says if you have land, we will give you a manufactured home. Everybody that lost their home as a result of Hurricane Katrina, they had land but it is in a flood zone. That is why they lost their home.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the President and to the director of FEMA, what is worse, to have 11,000 brand new, fully furnished manufactured homes spread out over Mississippi and Louisiana and Alabama with the storm victims who lost their homes and everything they owned in a bunch of different flood zones, or have them all grouped together in a cow pasture at the Hope airport, an area prone to tornadoes, an area that is going to have a tornado warning probably about every 10 days for the next 3 months?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to come to the floor of this Chamber and talk about this until FEMA gets moving, until FEMA comes to Hope, Arkansas, picks up these 11,000 manufactured homes they have purchased, and gets them to the people who desperately need them, people who for the sixth and seventh month in a row are living in hotel and motel rooms, people who are living literally in tents in Pass Christian, Mississippi.

This ran on the front page of the Arkansas Democratic Gazette back in De-

cember. I do not know if this gentleman is still living in this tent or not. He was in December. I can tell you about 100 families are living in tents in Pass Christian right now. It is appalling to know as a country we are allowing people to live in tents. He has found a job. He is back at work, doing the best he can for himself and his family. He is waiting on housing, and yet we have 11,000 brand new, fully furnished, manufactured homes purchased by FEMA, sitting in a cow pasture in Hope.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that as a member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, this is the kind of government waste that turns people off. I grew up in a little country church outside of Prescott, Midway United Methodist Church, and I heard a lot of sermons about being a good steward, and I can tell you FEMA is not being a good steward of our tax money with what they are doing. It is a total disgrace. It is an outrage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROSS has so eloquently stated the great failure in our American government today. The whole situation of Hurricane Katrina marks one of the darkest spots in American history. But there is a pattern here of a lack of response. There is a pattern of whatever it goes through, security, homeland security, national security. Hurricane Katrina is just one example. We need look no closer than our port security. What a debacle.

That same kind of lack of proper research, proper debate, and you are absolutely right, a lackadaisical congressional leadership, a Republican leadership that simply has just bent over for this administration. We have made a mockery of what our Founding Fathers said we should be doing as checks and balances. That is why they set three branches of government: the judicial, executive and legislative branches.

□ 2145

It is our job to provide the oversight, the investigation, the enforcement arm, to be able to make sure that there is a proper check and balance. But this House of Representatives under this Republican leadership has all too often just caved in and caved down, and that is why we are in the shape that we are in today.

Now, if we can talk just for a moment, which I want to do, about this port security situation that again points up the same fallacies.

Mr. ROSS. It is about accountability.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. It is about accountability, and it is also about our budget. For example, if you remember, after 2001 Congress appropriated a total of \$765 million for port security programs, including \$173 million for FY 2006, to help our seaports adopt important security enhancements.

The Coast Guard came and told us they needed more like \$6 billion. Yet, like last year, the President's budget

once again proposed terminating funding dedicated to port security, and then turned right around and takes that \$6 billion and says let's give it over here to a company that is owned by a country that has direct financial ties to terrorist organizations.

How do you figure this, that the President's budget would propose terminating that funding that our Coast Guard, the one main element we have checking our ports, asked for, advocate terminating it, and then turn right around and okay a deal that he says he did not even know about?

Now, the truth is plain here, and we owe it to the American people. There are some of us in Congress who are willing to stand up and tell the truth and deal with this, because our financial security is vital, is extraordinarily important.

I want to just touch upon one additional thing. I want to talk about just for a moment, as my good friend from Tennessee pointed to, this budget and the meanness of these cuts, but where they hurt the most are with our military families, are with our veterans.

I do not believe that the American people quite understand this or quite are aware that this budget would increase the health care costs for 1 million veterans. For the fourth year in a row, the budget raises health care costs for 1 million veterans by imposing new fees for veterans, costing them more than \$2.6 billion over 5 years, and driving at least 200,000 veterans out of the system. That is what this budget does to our veterans.

It would double the copayment for prescription drugs from \$8 to \$15. That is what this budget does to veterans. It imposes an enrollment fee of \$250 a year for category 7 and category 8 veterans, those who make as little as \$26,000 a year. If increases health care costs for military retirees. The budget increases TRICARE health premiums for 3.1 million of the Nation's military retirees under 65. The premiums will double.

It fails to address the strain on our troops. I just returned from Iraq and Afghanistan. I was there talking with the troops. Despite recent reports of the tremendous strain that the Iraq and Afghanistan wars have placed on our troops, the President's budget fails to fund and plan adequately to recruit the number of forces that are authorized under the law to help with that strain. The budget would fund 17,000 fewer Army National Guard and 5,000 fewer Army Reserve than are authorized by law. But it does not just stop there. It goes on and on.

You talk about your folks in Hope, Arkansas, and what they are faced with. Let me tell you what my people are faced with so much in Georgia, in one county, Cobb County alone, just from the cuts in the Community Development Block Grant program.

This is what the President has proposed cutting: one center that is in great need of help in terms of being

built and being sustained through the Community Block Grant program of \$3.1 million, the Ron Anderson Center over in Powder Springs in Cobb County. Another center for senior citizens where they need it the most, cut out of this budget, another \$2.5 million. Those community block grants are the lifeblood of many communities in Hope, Arkansas; in Tennessee; and all over.

Now, I mention this, as we will mention a few other things. There is so much in this budget that goes at the heart of cutting out almost the heart and the hope of our people.

You showed an extraordinary picture there a moment ago, Mr. ROSS. You showed a victim down there under just a cover, all he had, just sitting there. It showed great hurt, great need. There is a great hurting and a great need of the American people, and we do not need to pass this budget that cuts the very programs that will help our people in need.

Mr. ROSS. Again, it takes a lot of skill for this administration, this Republican-led Congress, to give us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history while also managing to cut all the programs that matter to people at the same time. How do they do that? By tacking on tax cut after tax cut.

Following us this evening, I am pretty confident that the other side will show up, which I think probably is an indication that we are making progress here in getting our message out about trying to restore some fiscal discipline and common sense to our Nation's government, and they will probably talk about how we had an opportunity to cut, to cut, \$40 billion in spending and how we voted against it.

But what they will not tell you is that it was \$40 billion in cuts to the most vulnerable people in our society. Medicaid, eight out of 10 seniors in Arkansas are on Medicaid. One out of five people in Arkansas are on Medicaid. Cuts to Medicaid, cuts to student loans to the tune of \$40 billion, followed by what are we doing this week and next week? About \$90 billion in additional tax cuts for those earning over \$400,000 a year.

I wasn't real good at math back in high school or college, Mr. Speaker, but the last time I checked, \$90 billion in tax cuts from borrowed money because we don't have a surplus and \$40 billion in cuts from the poor, the disabled, elderly and college students equals \$50 billion in new spending. Only in Washington would you entitle a bill that increases the national debt by \$50 billion the Deficit Reduction Act. Yet that is exactly what we will probably hear more about tonight, just as we did last week.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman makes an excellent point. I would like to challenge those who speak after us, if they even know about the existence of this "Financial Report for the United

States in 2005." I bet that no Republican in the House even knows this report exists, even though it is signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, it is an official U.S. Government document, and it reveals the true deficit for America last year as being \$760 billion.

If my friend would put back up the Blue Dog debt and deficit sign, please, I think it is very important that people compare that. Those numbers are truly staggering, \$8.2 trillion debt; and your individual share back home is \$27,000 for every man, woman, and child.

But, guess what? That is the good news. If you look at this document from the Department of Treasury, guess what our real debt is? It is not \$8.2 trillion. I wish it were. It is a staggering \$46 trillion. That is an unimaginable figure, \$46 trillion. That is an unimaginable sum of money.

But get this: every American's share, every man woman and child in this country, the share isn't \$27,000 like you have on your sign; the share is \$156,000 apiece. For every full-time worker's family, the share is \$375,000 apiece.

Mr. ROSS. If the gentleman would yield, the point is we are not trying to make this any worse than it is. We wish it wasn't bad. We wish we had a balanced budget. We wish the debt was being paid down. We wish we were not deficit spending. We don't have to try to make the numbers any worse than they already are. They already are setting records.

Just to clarify, the difference between these numbers and your numbers, the difference between the numbers in the budget and the numbers in the financial report of the United States Government is basically this simple: our government, our budget uses a cash-basis form of accounting, which gets you to these numbers.

Mr. COOPER. Which is illegal for most every business in America.

Mr. ROSS. Yet our very government, which uses a cash-base form of accounting, requires every business in America for the most part to use an accrual base of accounting.

Mr. COOPER. This is real accounting, and people back home need to know that for every working family, it is a \$375,000 obligation already. So what the gentleman is talking about, this \$27,000, that is the price of a pretty nice car. This is the price of a luxury home. This is what every working family already owes to pay for the promises this Congress and this administration have already made for our Social Security beneficiaries, our Medicare beneficiaries, so many other good and worthy programs.

As my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, pointed out, today we are having to borrow most of this money from foreign countries. President Bush has borrowed more money himself from foreign nations than all previous Presidents in American history combined. That is a staggering thing to comprehend.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ROSS. Based on the accrual-basis form of accounting, the real United States deficit in 2005 was \$760 billion.

Mr. COOPER. Over twice as large as the administration will admit.

If the gentleman will yield for one more moment, the Director of Office of Management and Budget, Josh Bolton, says the deficit is only \$319 billion; it is actually getting smaller, it is turning up. He says the President in just a few years will cut the deficit in half.

That is according to the cash basis. According to accrual, according to real accounting, guess what? The deficit is \$760 billion, and getting bigger all the time. So it is going in the opposite direction from what Director Bolton says. So who do you believe, Director Bolton of the OMB, or the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow?

I think the American people need to know that both of these documents exist, both of them are official U.S. Government documents, put out by the Republican administration; but this is the one they have tried to keep hidden from the American people.

Mr. ROSS. A highlight from the financial report of the United States Government, this official government publication, you can find this on page 23, of the 26 agencies scored under the President's management agenda, 17 of them were deemed to have "any of a number of serious flaws when it comes to financial performance."

Then you go on to page 28, and this is a quote from David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States of America: "The current financial reporting model cash-basis accounting provides a potentially unrealistic and misleading picture of the Federal Government's overall performance, financial condition and future fiscal outlook," which is exactly why our government requires businesses to not use the cash-based form of accounting, rather accrual-based form of accounting.

Yet when you hear from our government, they never want to quote this report. They want to report the budget which uses what the Comptroller General of the United States refers to as an unrealistic and misleading picture, through the cash-based form of accounting.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. When you combine this with the startling revelation that half of this debt is being held by foreign countries, I go back to that word "security." Is it in our best security interest to have our financial well-being held in the hands of foreign countries? That is about as ridiculous as holding our port security in the hands of a foreign company owned by a country that had terrorist dealings, that provided nuclear materials to Iran, a country where two of the hijackers came from. This word "security" needs to reverberate throughout the American psyche.

□ 2200

We are depending too much on our financial security and our national security and port security from foreign interests. We Americans need to control our ports, and we need to have Americans at ports where they are originating shipments coming in.

And we need to check 100 percent of our cargo. Mr. ROSS, if Hong Kong can check 100 percent of its cargo coming into its ports, and it checks 22 million cargo pieces a year, we check only 11. Hong Kong is not even a terrorist target and we are. Hong Kong checks 100 percent.

They are not a terrorist target; we are a terrorist target, do not check but 5 percent. As Ethan Hunt said in Mission Impossible, the NOC list is out. It is out in the open. They know that we do not check but 5 percent of our cargo.

But the point I wanted to make in terms of the foreign lenders is, because I think it is important, Mr. ROSS, that the American people know who is holding our debt. Let me just tell them for a minute. Japan holds \$682.8 billion of our debt.

Communist China, Communist China holds \$250 billion of our debt. Great Britain, \$223 billion. The Caribbean banking centers, \$115 billion; Taiwan, \$71 billion; OPEC countries, \$67 billion; Korea, \$66 billion; Germany, \$65 billion; Canada, \$53 billion; Hong Kong \$46 billion.

This is not in the best interests of the security of this country and it has to change.

Mr. ROSS. The gentleman is so right in his assessments. We do need to be borrowing money from foreign central banks and foreign investors. And, in fact, I believe it should be an American company that manages our ports. And with the cuts, we know what has happened in terms of our country becoming way too dependent on foreign oil.

And yet, if we are not careful with the proposed cuts to agriculture, we are going to become dependent on foreign countries like Brazil for our food and fiber. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that having a safe and reliable source for food and fiber here at home from America's farm families is every bit as much critical to our national security as oil is.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia made some good points. And, you know, this is not partisan debate. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It may be the first time in 50 years the Republicans have controlled the White House, House and Senate. It may be the Republican leadership that has given us the largest budget deficit ever in our Nation's history for the sixth year in a row.

But it is not a Democrat or Republican issue, it is an American issue, because this debt, this reckless spending, affects all of us as citizens of this country and as taxpayers. And, Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens of this country, first and foremost.

But to validate what the gentleman from Georgia is saying, again I quote from David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States of America, found on page 28 of the Financial Report of the United States Government for 2005, "Continuing on this unsustainable path will gradually erode, if not suddenly damage our economy, our standard of living, and ultimately our national security."

He goes on to say, "More troubling still, the Federal Government's financial condition and long-term fiscal outlook is continuing to deteriorate."

And I cannot thank the gentleman from Tennessee enough for making the people of this country aware of this little-known document. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, you know the 9/11 Commission did a great job in their report. It became a best seller. It was in bookstores all over America, because everybody in America wanted to find out what really happened on that terrible day.

You know, this is a lot like the 9/11 Commission report, because it is very readable, and it needs to be in every bookstore in America. And yet hardly anyone in Congress has seen it, hardly anyone in the Senate has seen it. Everybody needs to read this document, because it is the annual report for America.

It reveals the terrible truth that the real 2005 fiscal deficit for America was not \$319 billion, it was \$760 billion. And every living American worker already today owes \$375,000 apiece. That is what this document says. It is not thick. If you do not find it in the bookstore yet, and it will be months probably before that happens, take it off the Web site.

Look at the BlueDogDemocrats.dot.com. If you do not trust our Web site, go to www.gao.gov, that is the Government Accountability Office, or download it from the U.S. Treasury Web site. But this is a truly startling and amazing document, and hardly anybody even knows it exists.

So I encourage folks not to take our word for it, go look at it yourself and see what you think about the fiscal finances of our country after you read this book.

Mr. ROSS. Now we have about 6 or 7 minutes left this evening to talk about being good stewards of our tax money, about being good stewards of the public trust.

But as I promised at the beginning of this hour, our national debt, about an hour ago, was \$8,270,909,436,190. In the last 60 minutes, our national debt has gone up approximately \$41,666,000.

Mr. COOPER. Forty-one million dollars in an hour?

Mr. ROSS. In 60 minutes, in 1 hour, our national debt has increased to the tune of approximately \$41,666,000 and some change. And so you can see an hour ago what the debt was: \$8,270,909,436,190. That is no longer true. It is now \$8,270,951,102,190.

Mr. COOPER. That much damage was done to our Nation's future just in 1 hour.

Mr. ROSS. In the last hour.

Mr. COOPER. And that will continue every hour, every night.

Mr. ROSS. Again, we have got to be good stewards of our tax money. We have got to be good stewards of this country. We have got to get our Nation's fiscal house back in order. We must restore fiscal responsibility to our government. It affects every one of us in a lot of different ways.

For example, our Nation is spending a half a billion dollars a day with a "B," 500 million, a half a billion every day, simply paying interest on the national debt.

We could finish I-69 in Arkansas, creating all kinds of jobs and economic opportunities, just with 3 days' interest on the national debt, or I-49, again with 3 days' interest on the national debt.

Many of America's priorities are going to continue to go unmet. Many of America's needs are going to go unmet, from health care to education to veterans to infrastructure, until we get our Nation's fiscal house back in order.

The Blue Dog Coalition has a way to do that. It is a 12-point plan, and the first and foremost of all of those 12 points is require a balanced budget. Forty-nine States do. My wife requires one in our household in Prescott, Arkansas.

The family business my wife and I own, our banker requires us to have a balanced budget. And it is time for this Nation, it is time for the politicians in Washington to have a balanced budget for our Nation.

I yield to the gentlemen from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out, and you touched upon it, that just the interest, just the interest alone, is nearly \$200 billion.

Now just think about that. This money that we are borrowing, we have to pay for. You got to add in the \$200 billion in interest on top of that, which is more than five times the amount that we spend on education, the environment, and veterans care put together.

I submit to you, my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition, I just hope that the American people have been listening to us tonight, and I believe that they have. I hope that we have awakened a sleeping giant. Because, like I say, we are here and we are gone tomorrow.

The President does not have to run anymore. He does not have to go out and face the people. I believe, quite honestly, if he had to go out and face the people, I do not think he would have made that deal with the Arab immigrants. I do not think he would have done that.

But the fundamental question we have to go back to is from this star-

ting information that you have brought to us, the question has to be, why? Why are we just discovering it and why is this great discrepancy there?

There are some serious questions that have to be answered by this administration. But you know what? They are not going to answer these questions unless and until we in Congress stand up and represent the interests of the American people and put their feet to the fire. Once we do that, then we are truly standing up for America, and America deserves that.

Mr. ROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for joining me this evening as we try to hold this Congress accountable and urge a good dose of common sense and fiscal responsibility.

For folks with questions or comments or concerns, I encourage them to e-mail us at bluedogs@mail.house.gov, we are members of the fiscally conservative Democratic Blue Dog Coalition, bluedogs@mail.house.gov. That is bluedogs@mail.house.gov.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are here this evening for a simple reason and a simple cause; that is, to try and be good stewards for this Nation of the tax money and the trust that has been placed in us for the people.

We think this Congress is letting the American people down. I yield back.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENT). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, you know, last week I was sitting in the Chair when some of this same material was being presented here on the floor. And I jotted down some notes, thinking, well, one of these days I hope I am going to have a chance to make some comments about some of those things that are being said, not knowing I was going to be asked tonight to come over here and use some of the Special Order, because a couple of my colleagues were called away who had planned to be here tonight. So I am doing this at sort of the last minute.

But I found my notes from last week, and I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the comments that were made last week, again on this issue, and some of the comments that are being made tonight. I am astonished again at the hypocrisy that is evident here on the floor of this House every day.

We have our Democratic colleagues standing up all of the time talking

about how we need to cut spending, cut spending, cut spending, and how we have got a debt. But when we bring in bills and give them the opportunity to cut spending, they vote against them.

Much of the spending that is occurring now is the result of Democratic programs that were begun in the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, that have been put on automatic pilot.

One of the first meetings I came to when I was elected to Congress last year, I heard people talking about mandatory spending and discretionary spending, and entitlements. And I got up and I said, you know, I have read the Constitution, and nowhere in the Constitution do I see the words mandatory spending, discretionary spending, or entitlements.

A large part of the problem that we have in this Congress is that we have people who think in those terms. They think in terms of entitlement, and they have helped create in this society an entitlement mentality.

And when the President proposes, and the Republicans propose to try to change that mentality, the Democrats vote against it. The President said last year, "We have got a terrible problem with Social Security. The problem is that we are going to run out of money. There is not enough money in Social Security."

And when the Social Security program was established back in the 1930s, nobody ever thought that anybody would get any money from it to begin with. The average age in those days was 59 years old. So they set Social Security up to be collected when people became 65, assuming nobody would collect from Social Security.

But lo and behold, this country has prospered and people are living a lot longer.

□ 2215

The average age now is about 78 years. People are thinking that they can retire at 65 and live on their Social Security, and that is just not possible. So the process makes a proposal, let us do something about Social Security.

Let us explain to the American people that the Congress controlled by the Democrats for over 40 years, as they admitted tonight, spent that money as it came in, did not put it aside for Social Security. I am ashamed to say that Republicans have done the same thing. They came in and they spent the money on Social Security. But people are waking up to the problem and the President says, let us do something about it. Let us create personal Social Security accounts. Let us put people's Social Security money into an account with their name on it, give them some options about where that money is going to be invested, and let them know what they are going to get when they retire. No more of this fooling the American people into thinking that they have paid in a certain amount of money and it is going to let them live in the style to which they have become accustomed while they worked.

It is a cruel hoax that has been perpetrated on the American people. The average Social Security payment now is \$921. I do not know anybody who can live on \$921 a month; but when we tried to bring in proposals to do something about it, the Democrats shot them down. The Democrats go out and use terrible language to scare people to legislate about what is going to happen with Social Security. They talk to-night about lack of accountability. We really do need accountability in this country. We need accountability for all of us. We have to individually be accountable, and the Congress needs to be accountable. And part of our attempt to be accountable is to explain to people what the problems were with Social Security.

The Democrats just want to hide their head in the sand about it. They want to put the problem off and off and off. They do not want to deal with that. But it is a program that has developed an entitlement mentality in this country, and we have got to change that.

They talk about lack of accountability, and they talk about that in terms of FEMA. And I wonder, all of these people are talking about that and criticizing FEMA tonight for not having a plan and not being accountable, all of them voted for the Katrina money, all of them voted to give that money out with no plan and with no sense of accountability. Just a very small number of us voted against that because we wanted a plan and we wanted accountability.

Again, the hypocrisy is simply unbelievable when it comes to these folks. They talked last week about how local communities have become dependent on the Federal Government, the COPS program, education funding, all of these programs that are being funded at the State level and at the local level. Again, that has developed a sense of entitlement. When the Democrats were in charge of the Federal Government, they wanted people to come to them and ask for the money, and they wanted to be the people with largess in giving out that money. Unfortunately, we have developed that mentality in the country that local and State governments should be dependent on the Federal Government.

There is nothing in the Constitution that says the Federal Government has any business being involved in education. And yet we are funding huge dollars in education and that, again, has developed a sense of entitlement for the local people. They think the Federal Government should be giving them this money. It is a real travesty because those dollars come to the Federal Government and just a portion of them go back to the local and State governments. Whereas, if we did not take that money to begin with and left it at the State and local levels, the folks would be gaining much, much more from it, and they would be able to spend that money the way they want to spend it instead of based on the

ideas of Federal bureaucrats who want to do that or even, perish the thought, some Members of Congress who decide how it should be done.

They went on and on and on about how any potential cuts would be cutting services at the local level. And yet they say we need to cut the deficit. I really hope that the American people are going to be smart enough to see that these folks are talking out of both sides of their mouths. They want to cut the deficit, and yet they want to increase spending. They want to increase spending for things that are constitutionally Congress, things that the Federal Government has no business doing; and yet they want to put us deeper in debt, ultimately to have to raise taxes. They know that that is going to be the net result of it. And it is unbelievable to me how they can get on the floor every night and talk about that.

They talked about Congress is living for today, leaving a burden to our children; we should be paying our own way. Well, again, last fall we had a reconciliation bill that would not only cut spending but cut the growth of spending. Did any Democrats vote for that? No. Not a single one. The only people who voted for that were Republicans and not all Republicans voted for that. But there were many, many of us who understood we have simply got to rein in the appetite of the Federal Government for spending. We simply cannot continue at the level at which we are going. And yet there are many people who are frightened to try to cut the Federal budget because they know that this will be used against them, that the issues will be distorted.

When we cut growth, we are accused of cutting programs. We are not cutting programs. We are trying to cut growth. We made modest, modest changes in the spending for Medicaid in that reconciliation budget. We went from 7.3 percent growth to 7 percent. Modest changes. And what we tried to do was rein in the abuses. We tried to make sure that people would not be able to put their family members on long-term care for Medicaid and avoid paying for that themselves.

Part of that mentality that has developed in this country is that we have an entitlement society. I talk to my colleagues a lot about the use of language, and I have said the words we use are important to us. When we stand up here and we talk about "mandatory spending" and "discretionary spending" as both Republicans and Democrats do, I will have to say then we are creating a mindset for people. We are saying there is such a thing as mandatory spending. And, again, if we look at the Constitution, which ought to be the basis for why we do everything in this country, we never see those words "mandatory spending" and "discretionary spending."

Congress is in charge of spending, and it is entirely appropriate that budget bills come out of the House of Representatives. That is our job and we

should continue to do that. But we have got to break the habit of talking about discretionary and mandatory spending. The only mandatory spending that the Congress should be doing is to provide for a national defense. That is the main role of the Federal Government, and we have to remember that. We have to remember that it is our job as a Federal Government to provide for the defense of this country. State governments cannot do that. Local governments cannot do that. The Federal Government is the only government entity that can do that. That is why we are fighting a war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and all over this world we are fighting a war on terrorism. We did not create the war. The war came to us. But it is our responsibility as a Federal Government to do that.

I often wonder how we would have been able to have stayed in World War II, to win that war and to defeat the Nazis and to defeat fascism if we had had the kind of press that we have now and the kind of naysayers that we have on the other side of the aisle. They would have gotten us out of that war long before we won that war because of the kinds of approaches that they have.

They do not understand the role of the Federal Government. They do not understand that that is what it is we should be about here. They want to do things that we have no business being involved in, providing 100,000 policemen across this Nation. We certainly do want to help the local governments solve their crime problems, but the way we can do that is get the Federal Government out of the way and let them do that at the local level, not by providing a pittance of money and then holding all kinds of strings attached to it and not allowing them to spend that money the way they need to spend it at the local level, just like we do in education, just like we do in other areas.

Last week when my colleagues were here talking about things that we should be doing and should not be doing, they brought up the issue of health care and talked about how we should not be cutting any kinds of funds out of Medicare. They talked about the Medicare part D plan and how it is not saving taxpayer dollars. They are going out and holding town hall meetings and talking about what a bad program it is and then encouraging the people in their districts to sign up for it. So, again, they are talking out of both sides of their mouths.

They talked last week about let us back up our promises by fully funding health care and education, and yet tonight they are standing up here and they are saying we have got to cut the deficit. We have got to cut back on spending. We are leaving a debt to our children. And I am quoting from last week again: "We back up our promises by fully funding our health care and education priorities."

What does that mean “fully funding” that? As far as I know, that is what socialists do. They fully fund their programs and keep people dependent on the Federal Government or on the type of centralized government that they have. They are saying that if we get out of doing business at the local and State level, then we are going to force the local and State agents or governments to raise taxes. Again, they do not understand the proper role of the Federal Government. It is up to the locals to decide what they want to do in education and what they want to do with policing.

They talked about the Federal Government would renege on its fundamental commitment to community safety by cutting the money going out for the COPS program. Nowhere do I see again in the Constitution “community safety.” I do see where it is up to the Federal Government to provide for an army and for national defense, but it is not our job to be doing that.

They say we are making progress in the battle against methamphetamines. Today in the PATRIOT Act we had the major methamphetamine legislation that is probably going to pass in this session of Congress, very, very important legislation worked on by many Members of Congress. Did they vote for it? No, they voted against it. Did they vote for the PATRIOT Act so that we could have the tools that we need to make sure that terrorists cannot come back here and do to us what happened on 9/11 because of a lack of effective dealing with that under the previous administration, ignoring all the signs that terrorists were going to be doing these kinds of things? No. They voted against it.

They really do believe that nobody is paying attention or that the people who are paying attention are only going to be hearing some of what they need to be hearing. They think that we are not going to call their hand when they are being hypocritical and when they are out and out lying.

Last week they talked about the higher education bill increasing the cost of college loans. That is absolutely wrong. What we are doing in the higher education act is to help students be able to get loans at a lower rate and have to pay back less money than they have had to pay back under Democratic administrations and under Democratic Congresses that want to make these loans more expensive and to keep people unsure of what it is they are paying for.

They talk about the fact that many people in our country are poor because they have not had the opportunities to be as prosperous as others; but what they want to do, they say, is have the Federal Government make them not poor. Again, that is socialism as I understand it.

□ 2230

What we have to do in this country is provide for opportunities to people. We

are the freest country in the world. There is no place in the world where folks have the opportunities that they have in the United States of America. They can choose to go to college. They can choose to do any kind of work they want to do. They can do all kinds of things to create prosperity for themselves. The government is not going to create prosperity.

There is one place last week, and I have to find the point that I was trying to make, where they talked about government investment in programs. Every time I hear that phrase “government investment,” it is like somebody scraping their fingernails across a blackboard for me. The government does not invest in programs. Government spends money. People invest in themselves and invest money, but the government does not do that. We do not get a payback on the money that the government spends. It is spent and it is gone.

Now, the government has certain obligations; we all know that. Again, most of the obligations are at the local and State level, not at the Federal level, but what our colleagues would like you to believe is that the Federal Government can fix anything.

They talk about the problems with Katrina and the problems with FEMA. I would contend that they, again, are talking out of both sides of their mouth. They believe that the Federal Government can fix everything so that what we should be doing is putting more money into FEMA, putting more money into these programs. The Federal Government is not equipped to do that. The Federal Government should not be the first responder.

In the Katrina situation, all levels of government, in my opinion, failed. I think none of them were prepared for what happened, but it is wrong to expect the Federal Government to go in and act like a first responder. The Federal Government should go in and take care of those things that the State and local governments cannot take care of. Leaving all those buses parked in New Orleans, not getting people out when they were told to get out, that was the responsibility of the local and State governments. That was not the responsibility of FEMA. That was not the responsibility of the Federal Government, and yet, all that is lumped into the discussions of the failure of the Federal Government.

I am sorry, but I just do not think we are going to take that blame at this level. There is plenty of blame to go around for what things the Federal Government does not do, but we are not going to take the blame of not being prepared and not taking care of those people in New Orleans. That was the responsibility of those local and State elected officials, and it is a real shame that they did not do that.

I think I will use my glass as an illustration. I have got it just about half full. Some people would say it is half empty. I think that this is an illustra-

tion of the problem that our colleagues see. Everything they see about this country is negative, negative, negative, negative. They have almost nothing good to say about it. You hear them night after night after night talking about the United States and talking about our government. You hear them only condemning, only saying negative things.

I happen to think that we live in the best country in the world and that we are doing a lot of things right. We are not a perfect country. None of us who are in elected office are perfect people, but we work hard at it, and we try to do the kinds of things that will make this country a better place.

I think always talking down the country and talking in negative terms is a very bad thing to do, and our colleagues, along with their willing accomplices, the mainstream media, do that all the time. You never hear the good news about what is going on in the economy, but there are a lot of good things going on in the economy. All they do is talk about negative things, and I am frankly tired of hearing them say that.

I want to point out some facts about the positive things about our economy. It has been growing for 17 straight quarters. You never hear that from the mainstream media. You never hear that from our colleagues.

The National Association for Business Economics predicts the economy will grow at a 4.5 percent rate in the first quarter of 2006. What is responsible for that? It is not because of government spending. The government does not create that kind of prosperity. That is created because of tax cuts and slowing down the rate of spending. But the tax cuts that the President proposed and this Congress instituted in the last 3 years are what is responsible for the positive things that have been happening in our economy.

After inflation, disposable incomes increased 2.2 percent in the last 12 months. You never hear that, again, out of our colleagues.

The Federal Reserve has reported that the median net worth of U.S. households increased 1.5 percent between 2001 and 2004. That is great news. We never read about it in the media.

January's unemployment rate fell to 4.7 percent, the lowest monthly rate since 2001, and lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Those are decades when Democrats were in control in the Congress. The unemployment rate was lower than the average of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. I think many of us can remember when interest rates in the 1970s were reaching 20 percent. It has been a long time since we have seen high interest rates and high inflation in this country. That has all come about in a Republican administration and a Republican-controlled Congress.

There have been 29 consecutive months of job gains in this country. That has come about not because of

government investment, additional government spending. That has come about because of cuts in taxes, which left the money in the hands of entrepreneurs and the people who create capital and create jobs, not coming from the government.

Our folks on the other side of the aisle can continue to spend. They, again, and their willing colleagues in the media and in Hollywood, they can try to change what are the facts, the people from the left, but the economy is strong, and it is growing stronger every day under Republican leadership.

Do I want to see spending cut even more? You are right. Do I want to see tax cuts made permanent? You are absolutely right. We need to do that. We need to make the tax cuts permanent, and we need to cut our spending so we put more money into the hands of the entrepreneurs and into the hands of business people who can truly create wealth, who can create jobs. The government cannot do that.

I am asked a lot of times by school groups, what is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. Well, there are a lot of differences between us, but usually we are in a time crunch and I do not have a whole lot of time to explain all of the differences. So I tell folks I am going to give them the short version of what is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. It really is sort of at the nub of the issue between what is the difference between us.

Democrats think that government can solve all of our problems: Take all the money you can from the public, give it to the government, let the government solve our problems. Republicans believe that Americans work hard for their money and they should be allowed to keep as much money as they possibly can; the government should only step in to do those things that people cannot do for themselves.

The Democrats have turned that on its head. It would be cradle to grave. Again, socialism. They would do their best to try to take care of everybody. It would not be a very pretty picture, though. We can already see that. The hand of government in so many things in our country now is taking away a lot of the incentive for people to work. It is creating, again, this culture of entitlement, which we have to get away from.

The Declaration of Independence in our country talks about the pursuit of happiness, not the delivery of happiness to the people from the Federal Government. We are free to pursue happiness and pursue prosperity.

There are some other good things about this economy that I want to share. Earlier this week, the Commerce Department reported that consumer spending shot up by nine-tenths of 1 percent in January, the strongest gain in 6 months. In addition, Americans' personal incomes rose by seven-tenths of 1 percent, the highest rate since September. Again, our economy has a posi-

tive momentum, and that momentum is the direct result of a pro-growth agenda from the Republican-led Congress and our Republican President.

□ 2240

It is the Republicans who are proposing that we slow down the rate of spending and that we leave more money in the hands of the American people. We want to have improved fiscal responsibility and at the same time show our commitment to continuing economic growth. We are the party that is working to improve the lives of the American people by lowering taxes, enacting legal reform, decreasing government interference into the lives of entrepreneurs and small business owners. That is what we have to do.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to continue to promote their tax-and-spend policies because they think they know how to spend the American people's hard-earned money better than they do. However, I think the Republicans know better than that and will prevail on this issue.

I hear a lot from my constituents about the high cost of health care, and I have used this analogy before: when I grew up, I grew up in the mountains of North Carolina, extremely poor, no electricity, no running water. My family was very poor. There were no jobs in those days in that part of North Carolina, but my family could afford health care. Even though we had very little money, both my parents worked, and I began working when I was 12 years old; but health care was not as expensive as it is now, and everybody that I knew of could afford health care. But almost nobody had insurance.

In fact, I guess only school teachers maybe who worked in our county, may have had health care through the State of North Carolina; but nobody else that I know of had health insurance, and so people could afford to go to the doctor when they got sick.

Now, we didn't run to the doctor for every little thing; but when we truly needed health care, we could get it, and we could pay our bills for it. I remember that very, very clearly.

However, what has happened in the last 50 years? Why has health care become so unaffordable for people? Why has the cost of health insurance gotten so high? I contend that the reason that has happened is because of the third-party payer. And the biggest third-party payer is the Federal Government. Any time you get the Federal Government involved in something, it is going to drive up the cost of that commodity. We know that. We have seen it happen in lots and lots of cases, but I do not think there is any case where it is more clearly the case than it is with health care.

The fact that we have gotten involved in Medicare and Medicaid is driving up the cost of health care. We also see that Medicare and Medicaid determine what is going to be paid out in other programs, because that is the

benchmark that insurance companies use. And so because people are getting their health care primarily from the government or from a third-party payer, folks are not scrutinizing how much it is costing. They do not care. They just say, okay, if an aspirin costs \$150, that is okay, I am not paying for it. Insurance is paying for it.

It is again a part of that entitlement mentality we have created and taking away the personal responsibility that we used to have so much of in this country. Because of government programs, we are diminishing the sense of personal responsibility and increasing the sense of entitlement. Slowly but surely, we are changing the entire culture of this country.

When I served in the North Carolina senate, I had a good friend from Asheville, North Carolina, who served with me and who used a wonderful analogy many times, and I think it is a great one to use here. What he would say is: if you throw a frog in a pot of hot water, he will jump out of it. But if you put a frog in a pot of cold water and then you gradually turn up the heat a little at a time, pretty soon that frog will be cooked and he wouldn't even notice it.

That is what has happened in this country over the years. We have turned up the role of the Federal Government, we have turned up the sense of dependency on the government, and what we are doing is we are creating major problems for our country. We are creating an entitlement mentality which we have to break ourselves away from or else we are going to find that we have a whole generation of people that think it is the government that should take care of them.

That is what I think my Democratic colleagues want, because they believe in the power of the government. Republicans believe in the power of the individual and of individual responsibility. And I think this is a message we are going to have to keep telling. It is going to take a long time, I think, for it to get out and for it to be absorbed and for people to be able to see the wisdom; but it is something we are going to need to talk about more and more.

And we have to talk about it honestly. We cannot continue the hypocrisy that is being used by our colleagues who talk on the one hand about decreasing spending but on the other hand taking care of everybody from the cradle to the grave and doing everything from the Federal Government level.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to once again address the

U.S. House of Representatives. We would like to thank the Democratic leadership for the time, Democratic leader NANCY PELOSI, and our Democratic whip, Mr. STENY HOYER, and also Mr. JAMES CLYBURN, who is our chairperson.

Also, we would like to come to the floor once again, Mr. Speaker, to share not only with the Members but with the American people the priorities not only of the Democratic Party, but of this side of the aisle on the Democratic side, and also the priorities of all Americans. Our vice chair, Mr. JOHN LARSON, communicates in the best way to many, many Democrats, Republicans, and Independents about our plan on this side of the aisle.

It would not be a plan, it would actually be action if we were in the majority. I think it is important to come up with a comprehensive approach, Mr. Speaker, and using a team effort to move us in the right direction as a country; whether it be homeland security, innovation, affordable health care, or other initiatives that we all embrace. If we can come together in a bipartisan way, then America will be stronger, and also other countries throughout the world will be stronger based on our leadership.

Unfortunately, we are not providing that leadership right now. When I say "we," I am talking about the Republican majority coming together with Democrats and finding a bipartisan way to approach many of the issues that are facing our country right now. That is very, very unfortunate. The work of the 30-something Working Group is to make sure that we can promote ideas that all Americans embrace, not just Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, but all Americans, even those that are not taking part in the voting process that we have throughout the country.

One may call it apathy of voting, but I think that I would phrase it as a number of Americans having very little trust in this system, very little trust in what goes on here in the Congress, very little trust in what happens over at the White House. And I think it is very, very important that we have a paradigm shift. I will go further and add that we need a shift in thinking here in Washington, DC, so that all Americans feel a part of this process; so that all Americans feel that they are being leveled with; and that all Americans know that the individuals that they elected from their communities, their cities or counties, that they have their best interests at heart when they come here to the U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 2250

Today we are going to talk about a number of issues, issues that are facing everyday Americans and things that we should be promoting here as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, some of the things I think are very disturbing that not only I am reading in the paper but Americans are

reading in the paper and watching on the news.

The whole issue as it relates to port deals, America being sold off not by foreign countries but by the policy that we pass here on this floor that have accumulated more debt in 4 years to foreign nations, foreign nations are buying U.S. debt, unprecedented in the history of the Republic. Ever since we have been a country, no other time such as this time have other countries owned so much of our debt. I think it is important for us to remember because there are a number of my constituents and a number of Americans that have fought hard. Literally, their grandparents have fought hard for them to salute one flag. I think we are putting that spirit, that good history that we have and the future they fought for to allow our children and grandchildren to salute one flag, not to have foreign interests owning our debt. I think it is very, very important that we pay close attention to that.

I am glad to be joined tonight by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from South Florida.

Congresswoman, I am glad we are continuing to have a level of consistency on not only challenging the Republican majority. The gentlewoman knows if we were in the majority, it would not be talk. We would be on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives talking about things that would make the lives better of Americans. I think the only thing that is stopping us from doing that is having enough votes in this House to have that vision turn into reality. I look forward to that day because I believe in this year Americans will have an opportunity to be able to promote their ideas and what they feel. Be it a Democrat, a Republican, a Green Party or an Independent, or a brand new voter, they will be able to have their voice heard.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is a pleasure to join the gentleman for our 30-something Working Group hour.

When I have been home in the community you and I share, I noticed, and this feeling is so palpable among the average voter, the average citizen in America, and I have been to several different cities in the last number of weeks, and to a person, regardless of party, Americana's confidence in their government has been badly shaken, and badly shaken because they look to the leadership here, the Republican leadership, because we do not control a thing. They have the Presidency, the House and the Senate. So when I say that their confidence in their government and leadership is badly shaken, it is essentially the fault of the Republican leadership. It is so disturbing.

I have only been in the Congress a year. I could list countless examples and share with people who have expressed their frustration and their sadness and their angst. My first year in Congress was capped by the bookends, starting 10 weeks into my service here, with the Terri Schiavo case and ending

the year with the confirmation of Judge Alito, now Justice Alito, to the Supreme Court who obviously we fear will further erode the right to privacy that we began the year eroding with the Terry Schiavo case.

If you look in between, sandwiched between those bookends, we have Hurricane Katrina, this port deal, we have the deficit. You have the debt, you have now the debt limit that we are struggling with, the budget reconciliation bill, the countless irresponsible budget cuts and the privatization of Social Security, the Medicare prescription drug fiasco, who the senior citizens that the gentleman and I represent, they are just in tears. They do not know what to do. Just in our community alone, there are 43 different plans offered by 18 different companies. It is pure insanity.

So it is no wonder that our constituents and the American people are frustrated. Their confidence in their leadership is badly shaken. Our responsibility over the next several months is going to be to help restore that confidence because we have that ability. We have an agenda and the things that we would do if we were here would restore that confidence, and those are the kinds of things that we talk about on this floor.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We like third-party validators, and I think it is important for the American people to understand this is not something that Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN or other members of the 30-something Working Group just dream up. I think it is important as an American, leave alone a Member of Congress. I am alarmed and very, very concerned about what is happening. I have children. I pray to God that they have children and the family line continues.

But I am concerned about right now. I am concerned about what is happening as relates to the irresponsible policies that have been passed by the Republican majority.

We are all friends. We all put our pants on one leg at a time, or what have you, but I think it is important that we alert Americans about this unprecedented time in the history of the country. I am saying right now as we speak, this moment.

I want to hold up, this is an article that came out today. It is an AP story. Any of the Members in their office can pull this up from the AP Web site. I think it is important. It says "Treasury Details Its Steps to Avoid Debt Limit." I want to read a couple of paragraphs here. Treasury Secretary John Snow, and this is Secretary Snow, he is a good guy. He is just an accountant for the United States of America. We appreciate his service and what he does in the Treasury Department. But John Snow told the Congress yesterday that the administration has taken all prudent and legal actions, to include tapping certain government retirement funds, to keep from reaching the \$8.2 trillion national debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about this because now we are tapping into funds that not only Federal workers but the people on the United States of America count on us to be able to govern correctly. In a letter to Congress, Snow urged lawmakers to pass a new debt ceiling immediately to avoid the first default on obligations in U.S. history.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about something that I embellished. This is what Mr. Snow said from the Treasury Department.

If I am the Republican majority, leave alone the leadership, I would be alarmed. I would sit up in my bed and say, we have to do something about it. What is unfortunate is that I know, as sure as my name is KENDRICK MEEK, representing Florida's 17th Congressional District, and by that we have been validated to represent the people of the United States of America, I know the Republican majority is going to rubber-stamp what Secretary Snow needs, because it is an outrageous example of the kind of spending and borrowing that this majority has taken us into.

I think it is important to promote what we have been trying to do on this floor as Democrats, time after time again, promoting pay-as-you-go versus borrowing. We are not out of control, the Republican majority is out of control. It is not just me name calling or finger pointing. This is fact, not fiction. I can see if it were fiction and if we were doing what we call in Washington, DC, the Potomac two step. I go left, you go right; no, this is what is printed not only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when you have the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Republican Senate, we have to be very alarmed. For Republicans and Independents that are paying attention to what we are saying on this floor, and other parties, they cannot say oh, that is just the Democrats glossing over the facts.

□ 2300

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am a freshman, and I have only been here a year, and I see this chart in between us. I am wondering, is this potential increase in the debt limit unprecedented? Is it the first time it has happened? Just illuminate for me what the history of debt limit increases is, if there is one.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, there have been in this Republican House, and I am just going to talk about President Bush being in office, this Republican majority, I am going to point the letters out and let you go ahead and drive your point.

December 29, a letter written, Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of 2005, the closing days, the 29th. Americans think about what they were doing on the 29th. Many Americans were off work, those that had jobs and what have you,

celebrating with their families, thinking about the new year.

Secretary Snow found his way to the office to send this letter to one of our colleagues over in the Congress, over in the Senate, that says, "We must raise the debt limit or we will be unable to continue to finance government operations."

That is just for this round. I mean, I think it is important that we get staff to be able to get the rest of the letters that Secretary Snow wrote.

Here is a letter just written in February, February 16. This letter is to the ranking member, Mr. JOHN SPRATT, who is the ranking member on the Democratic side, again saying, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we must do this now, Mr. Speaker, saying we must raise this debt limit as soon as possible or they are going to have to go into the Federal retirement system and stop paying into that system.

I want to say to the Federal workers, because we believe in third party validators and also believe in telling the truth, the Secretary goes on to say, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, he believes once the debt limit is raised, we will be able to pay back into the retirement system.

These letters are coming so fast and furious, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, we can't get them up on the big board. Here is a letter, March 6, that was just yesterday. Secretary Snow, this is alarming, he is saying, did you receive my two letters beforehand?

Then he talks to the press. We have a problem. NASA is also located in Florida, but also in Houston, but Houston, we have a problem. He is saying to the United States Congress, we have a problem.

How did we come about the problem and having to raise the debt ceiling? It is because of the policies of the Republican majority that have rubber stamped everything the President said do.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, yes, there are a number of letters and alarms going off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I have another question. In looking over our third party validators, I am wondering if you have got the Secretary of the Treasury setting off alarm bells and really saying that there is fire in the theater, why is it that we have not seen an increase in the debt limit on the floor? Could it perhaps be that that is something that the Republican leadership thinks is unwise to have their Members vote on? Is it that this is not the first time, as I asked you earlier, that the debt limit has been increased?

In looking at this chart just in the last few minutes, I notice that in June of 2002 the debt limit was increased by \$450 billion. And who was President then?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. President Bush.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I believe President Bush was in office then. In May of 2003, the debt limit was in-

creased by another \$984 billion, with a B. In November of 2004, the year of the election, \$800 billion. We have a \$781 billion increase pending now, with a total increase of \$3.015 trillion.

When President Clinton was in office, I was in the State legislature then, for a time until you were elected to Congress you were too, we had a system in place called PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, which it is my understanding is similar to the way people prefer in America to run their households, where you do not spend money that you don't have, unlike what is going on under the Republican leadership where they appear to enjoy spending like drunken sailors and "no" doesn't appear to be possible under this administration, unless, of course, it is to talk about continuing tax cuts for the wealthiest. We say "yes" to that. We say "yes" to anything politically that they want to advance. The "no" is to people who can't afford health care, cutting Medicaid. The "no" that they propose to say is to people who are struggling to pay for higher education.

So, if we went back to PAYGO rules, which we have proposed time and again and they have rejected time and again, then we would be again in a situation where it wouldn't be necessary to increase the debt limit because we would be only spending money that we have.

Here is another third party validator, which is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In 2006, in this budget resolution, of course it was defeated, 228 Republicans voted against it, it was defeated 264-165 when we proposed to return to the pay-as-you-go rules. Then again last year, it was defeated 232-194 and 224 Republicans voted against it.

So, to me to break this down in more simple terms, because PAYGO and billions and trillions and debt limit is something that if you are not dealing with it on a daily basis, it is somewhat difficult to understand, one of the things we like to do here is break things down for people that may be listening into regular terms, into the things that they deal with every day.

So I thought, Mr. Speaker, it would be a good idea, because a billion is a very big number, a billion is a hard concept to grasp, because most people don't deal in the billions when they are dealing with their everyday normal activity, so let's try to define what a billion is in the way that people think about things in their daily life.

Broken down, a billion hours ago, for example, humans were making their first tools in the stone age. That is how much a billion hours ago was, if you are thinking about what a billion means.

Let's think about what happened a billion seconds ago. A billion seconds ago it was 1975 and the last American troops had just pulled out of Vietnam. That is how big a billion is. We are in 2006. That was 30 years, 31 years ago.

A billion minutes ago it was 104 A.D., Mr. Speaker, and the Chinese first invented paper. That is how long ago it

was, if you think about a billion in terms of minutes.

Then a billion dollars ago, under this administration and under the Republican leadership, a billion dollars ago was only 3 hours and 32 minutes at the rate that the administration and this Republican Congress spends money.

So we have a billion hours ago, it was the stone age; a billion seconds ago, it was 31 years ago; a billion minutes ago, it was 104 A.D. and we were first talking about the invention of paper. But under the Republican leadership and this administration, a billion dollars ago was only 3 hours 32 minutes at the rate of spending under this administration and the Congressional leadership. It is just astonishing, it really is, if you think about it, broken down in this way.

All the American people want is their confidence restored. All they want to see is that the people here in this Chamber are using their heads and applying some common sense and thinking about the budget and the money that we spend in the way they would like to think about their own household budget, spending the money that we have, spending it wisely, spending it on things that they care about, not giving away the store, which unfortunately, it appears to be the direction that we have been going in.

We are giving away the store in so many ways. Like the port deal, for example. We represent Miami, both of us. I represent Fort Lauderdale. I have both Port Everglades and the port of Miami abutting my district.

I went down to the port of Miami, you and I have both been there, it is one of the six ports that the Dubai Ports World deal impacts, and for the people that I have talked to in our community and the calls and communications I have been getting, it defies logic. They really just cannot believe that the President does not understand why people are so deeply concerned that we would have a foreign government-owned corporation running the terminal operations at six of our major ports.

This is not just any government, this is a government that just 5 years ago was involved directly, indirectly, in both tangential and more substantive ways in the 9/11 attacks.

□ 2310

There were 58 references in the 9/11 Commission Report to the United Arab Emirates and their involvement, either through allowing the 9/11 financing to be funneled through their banks, or just the fact that two of the 9/11 terrorists lived in the United Arab Emirates.

But the astonishing thing is that there were no national security reviews triggered under the law when the administration's committee that reviewed these deals took a look at it. There were no alarm bells set off. And that is even more astonishing because it is not even like we are checking the vast majority of containers and goods

that come through our ports. Less than 6 percent, if you take a look at this chart, less than 6 percent of U.S. cargo coming through our ports is physically inspected, Mr. Speaker. Ninety-five percent is not inspected, 5 percent is inspected.

And that is in spite of the fact that Democrats have repeatedly proposed increasing the funding so that we can ensure more of the cargo coming through our ports is inspected. Literally what I learned when I went to the Port of Miami, Mr. MEEK, is that in the last 5 years we have increased our security funding at our airports by \$18 billion, which is a good thing. I mean that is absolutely essential.

And we have increased our port security funding by \$700 million. Now, if you remember, I just went over the difference of what a billion means. So \$18 billion on airport security, less than \$700 million on port security.

I mean, you cannot rest our Nation's security on taking your shoes off as you go through the magnetometer at an airport. That cannot be the sum total of the additional security that we have increased since 9/11. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the point was, and we were all campaigning during the initial vote for the war. But I remember making the argument as I was campaigning, as I think a lot of other Democrats were here in the House, instead of going off to war, the alternative was, now we are spending a billion and a half dollars a week in Iraq, I think one of the alternative proposals was to fund this stuff, take care of the Nation's security, take care of the ports, make sure that we have enough people to do the kind of real inspection that we think needs to be done instead of spending the money elsewhere.

And when you think about it in a logical way, that this money is going to be spent to hire American workers to protect America, it makes a lot of sense.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It has just been astonishing to me. I literally have had more calls in a shorter period of time on this issue from constituents, and not the organized calls, not the calls that groups generate, that they, you know, send an e-mail out to their members and say, call your Congresswoman, here is her phone number.

This is Joe and Jane Average Constituent who saw the news or read the newspaper or listened to the radio and called me and said, you know, what is going on here? Do these people not get it? How could they not get it? I have had little old ladies crying on the other end of the phone in my district office because the flames that have been fanned so much by this administration on the terror threat and national security, which is understandable because we really needed to raise the level of concern in America about being conscious of our own security. That is understandable.

But for the President to be shocked by the American people's reaction, that is what is so astonishing, that they are really the victims, I guess. Their decision is really the result of their own magnification of this issue. And, you know, that they have not responded with the funding that we need to enhance port security is just truly shocking.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to make this point too, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, we are not saying that when the Democrats take over in January that all of a sudden we are going to inspect every single ship that comes into the United States of America. That is not what we are saying.

But what we are saying, first is because we are going to have to start balancing the budget and start plugging a lot of the holes that the Republican majority will have left us to clean up, what we are saying is, 5 percent of the cargo coming in is a small amount.

And when the Democrats are in charge, we want to refocus our efforts on port security and make a little bit more of an effort. So it may not be 100 percent, but we are saying that it is a priority for us to make this kind of investment.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. The question, Mr. Speaker here is, does the Republican majority have the will and the desire to make the kind of change we need to take or make to protect this country? The will and the desire.

Now, the will may be there, but the desire is questionable. And I think it is important, because there are other priorities that the Republican majority, and I would say some of them join in with some of us Democrats, very few, unfortunately, it is in the single digits, because we are not able to promote some of things that we need to promote to protect this country.

Now over the weekend, there were a lot of pundits out there talking about, wow, you know, this thing may very well change, this thing meaning the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, because the Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, has fumbled the ball time after time again.

Since this is now NCAA time, they have lost the ball when they were supposed to shoot a shot on behalf of protecting this country. The other team is taking it the other way. I think it is important to get in the spirit. We have to break this thing down so that we all understand. Some people say we need to put the cookie on the bottom shelf so that everyone can reach.

I think it is important. I am using a metaphor, but I think it is important that everyone understands. Folks are wondering why we are alarmed. Now I can tell you, I speak here with great confidence, Mr. Speaker, because I have the facts here not fiction. I think it is important, Mr. RYAN, that we share with people that on January 29, 2005, during a meeting of the House and Senate conferees, our ranking Member on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY, offered,

along with Senator BYRD, one of the longest-serving Senators over in the Senate, offered an amendment to increase funding for port and container security by \$300 million.

The house conferees defeated the amendment along party lines. When we say along party lines, I want to make sure the Members understand. That means Republicans voted one way against that, increasing the funding so that we can be able to do what was said, secure the containers more.

Can we get that container chart up here, because I want to make sure, just in case the Republican majority, some of the Members have their television turned down, that they are able to see what we are talking about. Because I think it is important. There it is right there. It is already there.

These containers here that are being checked, the 5 percent of them, and I am questioning that as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee if it is really 5 percent. As Democrats, Mr. Speaker, we are not saying that we want to do something about it, we are trying to do something about it. But the Republican majority is not allowing us to do so.

And we want to make sure that we share with them, because we want their constituents to know and we want our constituents to know that we are fighting on their behalf. All of us are Americans saluting one flag.

On October 7, 2005, during a meeting of House and Senate conferees, that is when House and Senate Members come together. When the House and Senate pass their individual bills, they select certain Members to be able to go into a room and work out the differences between that bill.

That goes back to in our generation a cartoon, I am Just a Bill in Capitol Hill. Again, Senator BYRD and Representative OBEY, offered an amendment to increase funding to enhance port security by \$150 million. Republicans defeated it on a party-line vote.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I know you are getting on a roll.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I wanted to do a couple more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a point here. The last chart that we had up said that the Coast Guard is saying they need a \$7 billion increase in funding. Now you are reading these amendments.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, wait. Hasn't the President and the Republican majority said, we want to listen to people in the field and give them what they need when they ask for it? Am I correct?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right. Again this is a third-party validator. This is from the Federal Register. Coast Guard estimate to implement the Maritime Transportation Security Act, how much money do we need to protect ourselves? \$7 billion.

What has the Republican Congress appropriated? \$900 million, .9 billion. So we have got a long way to go here

as you can see. So as Mr. MEEK is going to start reading this stuff, Mr. Speaker, this is billions.

Democrats were trying to put amendments on that were like \$150 million. We are not even trying to increase it all that much. But we are saying we tried a billion. We tried \$500 million.

□ 2320

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We are trying to work in a bipartisan way.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a \$6 billion gap between what the Coast Guard says they need and what the Republican Congress appropriated.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are making a strong point here, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, it is not a point. This is fact, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important that we say June 18, 2004, Democrats supported an amendment to increase port container security by \$400 million. Republicans have refused to allow it to be considered, the amendment to be considered. That means they moved on a procedural way.

June 9, 2004, Democrats supported Obey amendment once again in Appropriations Committee to increase container security by \$400 million. Republicans defeated it on a party-line vote. That is House report 108-541, page 128.

Now, we have all of this stuff that will be on the Web site, Mr. Speaker, so that other Members can get to it, and it goes on and on and on.

Enough of this, the Democrats do not have plans. That is what the majority wants you to believe. We have plans. Unfortunately, they cannot be reality because the Republican majority does not want to work in a bipartisan way. And it is upsetting. It is beyond upsetting because our country is being jeopardized. Meanwhile, we have individuals that are hired by the Republican majority going out here talking to these cable shows and Sunday shows on spend. This is not about spend. This is about making America stronger and more secure.

The bottom line is the reason why, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, many of the Republicans are getting a little shaky now, because on this subject, Mr. Speaker, we have been on top of it. The record speaks for itself. Fiscal responsibility: we have been on top of it. On innovation: there is not an issue that Americans are looking for that we have not tried to address and continued to try to address even though we are in the minority. Being in the minority is not an excuse for us. It is just something that does not allow us procedurally to allow these American ideas to bubble up and allow the American people to be prepared.

You want to talk about fuel. We can talk about that too. You can talk about energy. We can do all of these things. But until the American people truly understand that what they hear from the Republican majority is not necessarily fact, then we are going to

continue to go in the wrong direction as it relates to the history of this country.

Being a Member of this Congress, I almost feel that we are just as important as the Continental Congress, the first Congress, because now, no other time in the history of the country have we been in this kind of posture as a country, not due to the fact what folks are doing on foreign soil. It is what the Republican majority is doing to us right now based on friends and family and a number of things that have taken place in this Chamber unprecedented.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I am sorry, I wanted to make sure I got that out because I think it is important, not only third-party validators, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and actions we have taken, because it does not upset me, the fact that this stuff is not being reported the way it should be reported; but I am extremely concerned about the fact that we have the Republican majority that is not even shaken by this. Meanwhile, 50 percent of our debt, almost 50 percent of our debt is being owned by foreign interests.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What is amazing, and you are so right, what has happened in the last several weeks is there has been an effort by the Bush administration since this DPW port deal has come to light to portray this as people who have a problem with Middle Eastern countries and even have gone so far as to say, well, why are you concerned, because Federal agencies control and conduct all port security.

I learned and knew this, but it was illuminated even more clearly when I went to the port that that is not the case. Yes, on the external port properties the government body running the port, in our case, in Miami it is the Board of County Commissioners in Miami, they are responsible for external security. But at a terminal in the Port of Miami Terminal Operating Company and under the five other terminals that DPW would take over, they are responsible for their own internal security. They will have intimate knowledge of the external security on the port property, and they are responsible for security internally.

This is a foreign government-owned company. This is not a private company from a foreign country. It is a foreign government-owned company.

Would it be okay with anyone in this country, not the least of which should be the Bush administration, if the same situation occurred in an airport? Would we let a foreign government-owned company run a terminal in our airports? Would we let them control loading and off-loading passengers or cargo coming into an airport? Not in a billion, no pun intended, years. Really.

Why are they so unconcerned about port security?

Let us look at what the Coast Guard is responsible for. Again, third-party

validators. The Coast Guard on a typical day saves 15 lives, assists 117 people in distress, protects \$2.8 million in property, interdicts 30 illegal migrants at sea, conducts 90 search and rescue cases, seizes \$21 million worth of illegal drugs, responds to 11 oil and hazardous chemical spills, and boards and inspects 122 vessels.

There are 361 ports in this country that they are responsible for, and we have 95,000 miles of coastline. And the difference between what the Coast Guard has said they needed, \$7.2 billion to really complete their mission in terms of port security, and what the Republican leadership here has appropriated, \$910 million, is \$6 billion. There is a disconnect from the top to the bottom here. It is shocking.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When you think about the \$16 billion in corporate welfare that we have given to the energy companies; when you think about the billions and billions and billions of dollars in subsidies we have given to the health insurance industry through the prescription drug program that has been a total debacle, you will see that what the Democrats are saying is that we have a better plan.

We will not give \$16 billion to the oil industry, the most profitable industry in the world, Mr. Speaker. We want to spend that money prudently, in a fashion that best represents the interests of the American people. And that is what we have been trying to do as Mr. MEEK went through, Mr. Speaker. Amendment after amendment after amendment, the Democrats and the minority tried to attach to the majority Republican Party's bills. And we tried to get September 29, and you can get all of this, and we should put all of this on our Web site so everyone can see Democrats have tried and tried and tried to get increased funding for homeland security and for the protection of our ports, whether it was Mr. OBEY from Wisconsin, Mr. SABO, Senator BYRD, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SABO again and again and again. All throughout.

This sheet goes from 2001, 2003, 2003, 2003, 2003, 2004, 2004. Time and time again the Democratic Party has tried to get amendments on spending bills that would increase funding for port security by \$100 million, by \$500 million, by more if we could try to plug this gap.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The thing that we did not mention yet that is the most outrageous is the President in his budget that he just proposed actually eliminates direct port security grants. He literally says, no, no, no, we do not need to directly appropriate grant money to individual ports for port security. I have a bright idea. He has a bright idea. He wants to let ports compete for security grant funding with railway stations and airports and have any one of these transportation-related entryways to our country compete for security grants.

I mean, I do not understand that. He proposed it last year, and the response

from the Republican Congress was a \$910 million appropriations for port security. And now he is proposing it yet again.

□ 2330

Where are their priorities? If we are going to propose cuts to try to get the budget deficit situation under control, do we start with port security? I mean, when they are sitting down around the table in the Roosevelt Room, I really want to be a fly on the wall sometimes. Who in there is saying port security grants, that is what we should, that is how we are going to solve the deficit? Medicaid funding, we have got all the poor people covered with health care; who are the people the most in need, where are our most significant needs, let us cut those. It is astonishing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Again, I just want to make this point because we are not demagoguing this issue. What we are saying is 95 percent of the cargo coming into the country is not inspected. All we are saying is it should not be 5 percent. Should it be 90 or 80 or 70 or 50 or 40? It should be certainly something more than 5 percent, and all we are saying is we are giving corporate subsidies to the oil industry, giving corporate subsidies to the energy companies, giving corporate subsidies, totally, billions and billions and billions, to the health industry. You are giving tax cuts to Bill Gates, and this is going on.

So Democrats, Mr. Speaker, want to say let us increase this gradually as we are able to balance the budget and hopefully make investments in this. You are going to hire American people, hire American worker, protect the country, send a signal across the world that do not even try it, okay. That is the bottom line.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is also specifically related to this Dubai Ports World deal a way to deal with it. There is the bigger issue of port security, and then there is this deal. What is it that is so darn important about this deal that it caused the President to threaten his first veto that if, God forbid, the Congress would do something crazy like pass legislation to stop it, to slow it down to conduct the national security review that should be done? I have the legislation that I have introduced on the House side and Senators MENENDEZ and CLINTON and BILL NELSON from our State that have introduced on the Senate side that would say that we should not allow foreign government companies to own or lease ports from us in this country and we should stop this deal and we should review the other foreign government-owned terminals that currently already are in the United States and give congressional oversight in that area.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a no-brainer, and we called for a vote last week, Mr. Speaker, to stop the port deal, period. Forty-five days for what? What do we have to think about

here? That 45 days later we are going to say it is okay for foreign interests to be able to operate six of our major ports, including New York, that the whole thing, 9/11, should mean something? Our major ports, fine, that is okay, but let me tell you something, we do not have to wait 45 days to not do the deal. You got folks in the Republican majority who say, well, you know, after 45-days we are going to—after 45 days, the facts are still going to be the facts.

The Coast Guard raised the question of security as it relates to this port deal, and deals like this happen every day here in Washington, D.C., under this Republican majority and this White House. The President dared the Congress to pass a bill because he would veto it. That is on the record. I did not say it. He said it.

You know something, I would like to tell the Republican majority to leader it. We are trying to call for a vote, and I guarantee you there will be another attempt to call a vote this week. We want to separate the leaders from the followers. We say we want to balance the budget, which we have done. The Republican majority say they want to cut it in half. You take the choice what you want. Do you want to continue to have foreign countries buy our debt? But that is for individuals willing to be followers. The thing about the United States is we believe in leadership. We want to lead. We do not want to follow.

The bottom line is the Republican majority is fine with following economically, following as it relates to leadership on this port deal. They have a problem because they have been rubber stamping everything that the President has said. The President says let us turn right, okay, let us turn right; okay, let us turn left, they turn left. That is not what the Constitution says.

We did not stand out in front of the precinct saying, hey, I am running for Congress; I am willing to do everything that the President asks me to do, regardless of how you feel about it. That is not what we ran for office for, Mr. Speaker.

So when we look at these deals, I think it is very, very important. Secretary Snow is asking us to raise the debt ceiling by \$82 billion. Who is going to buy that debt? Who is going to buy it?

Can I for a minute talk about who is buying it and who will buy it? Here is my map here again. This is not a weather map. This is a map to talk about who is going to buy this \$821 billion that Secretary Snow is calling for, not because he feels like it. It is because he has to.

I am going to start off with the big one. Japan, \$862 billion of our debt. Japan is not a county anywhere in any of these States. China, Red China, China has all the jobs. China, that has a positive trade with the United States but we do not have positive trade with them, are buying up our country while

the Republican majority is sitting here saying do not worry about it America, trust us. The UK, \$223.2 billion owned of the United States of America debt. Taiwan, \$71.3 billion. Korea, that should ring a bell with some people and especially some of our veterans, \$66.5 billion. Germany, Germany should ring a bell with some of our veterans, \$65.7 billion of our debt, and Canada, just north of, us \$53.8 billion. OPEC Nations, oh, wow, who are they? It happens to be Saudi Arabia, happens to be Iran, happens to be Iraq.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. UAE.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. \$67.8 billion. So, Mr. Speaker, when we start talking about raising the debt ceiling and responsibility, we balanced the budget. We did not have these issues. When I say "we," I am saying the Democratic Congress balanced the budget without a single Republican vote.

The reason why I speak boldly on this issue is the fact that it is fact and it is not fiction and that we are sharing it with them. The real issue, when you talk about the ports, some Members may say the bill that you have and a number of Members signed on to in the Senate, a number of Members who have signed on to it, Mr. Speaker, they are saying, well, you know, I do not represent a port city or a coastal city so I do not have anything to worry about. Well, guess what, these containers that we see here are all throughout America because these containers are loaded on to trucks and trains, and they go through America. If a terrorist wants to put a nuclear device in one of these containers to be put into activation in a certain U.S. city, they have the power to do so because they know that we only check 5 percent. That is not because we cannot check more. It is because we cannot get amendments passed here as Democrats in the minority to check more and protect America. So I think it is important we do it.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of this chamber that this is brinksmanship now with the debt ceiling. We are on the line here, and Secretary Snow, and I do not know if you went over this before.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I did but go over it again.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. March 6 sent a letter to John Spratt who is our ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee. Today, it was reported in the Associated Press the Secretary told Congress yesterday in this letter, the administration is taking, quote, all prudent and legal actions, end quote, including tapping certain government retirement funds. Now they are tapping retirement funds to keep from reaching the \$8.2 trillion national debt limit, and in the letter to Congress he said that we need to raise the debt ceiling immediately to avoid the first government default on its obligations in U.S. history.

□ 2340

If this outfit hasn't gotten us into a real predicament, I don't know what a

predicament is. If we don't raise the debt ceiling, we are going to default on our obligations. The United States of America, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history.

I would be happy to yield.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a very simple solution: we return to PAYGO rules. We return to the days when we spent what we had, like people in American households try to do every single day and struggle to do. But we have the ability to establish a rule. We have the ability to follow a rule that says we will only spend what we have. We have advocated, as Democrats, restoring the PAYGO rule, and we have been repeatedly rejected by the Republican leadership because they just want to continue to borrow and spend, borrow and spend.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So let us look at this. We talked about two things basically tonight. We talked about the ports and the debt ceiling. On the port deal, to try to increase spending, the Democrats offered, I don't know, a dozen different amendments to try to increase funding from U.S. ports, and each time the Republican majority shot our idea down.

We had ideas. We offered solutions. The Republican majority, Mr. Speaker, shot us down. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ just talked about the pay-as-you-go system, where if you pay more for a program, you have to find money somewhere. You have to raise revenue or cut spending, but you have to pay for it so we don't have to borrow from all these foreign countries.

Former Member Mr. Stenholm offered an amendment to try to implement PAYGO rules into the budget process. Mr. THOMPSON from California tried to do it, Mr. MOORE from Kansas tried to do it, and Mr. SPRATT tried to do it on numerous occasions, to implement pay-as-you-go rules to try to constrain the reckless spending from our Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker. And in each instance, Mr. MEEK, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, it was the Republican majority who said we will not accept fiscal discipline, we will not accept increased funding for our ports; and the Democrats were the party offering the ideas and offering the amendments time and time and time and time again to prevent this from happening, where we owe Japan \$682 billion, we owe China \$250 billion, and we owe OPEC countries, Mr. MEEK, \$67.8 billion.

Now, that is a shame. And I don't like that. And I don't think the American people like that.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, you are 110 percent right. As we close, Mr. Speaker, since we have only 3 minutes or so left, once again we have seen this chart, and as I have said before, it will be in the National Archives. We are not trying to make history, but just to report what is going on here so the American people will know this.

In 224 years of great history in this great country of ours, 1776 to 2000, 42

Presidents, \$1.01 trillion was borrowed from foreign nations. That is 224 years. And in 4 years, from 2001 to 2005, President Bush, and we don't want to leave out the Republican Congress, borrowed \$1.05 trillion from foreign nations, in 4 years, jeopardizing the financial security of this country.

Mr. RYAN, you are 110 percent right to be alarmed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You are 110 percent right to be alarmed.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Republican majority to give us a good way to talk about this. They can't. They can't, Mr. Speaker. We hope we can have what we call a paradigm shift, a change in the way we do business here in Washington, D.C., not on behalf of the Democratic Party but on behalf of the American people.

So we are looking for a comprehensive game plan, Mr. Speaker, because we have one. We have one on this side. History is on our side. The precedent is on our side of trying to do something about it. We ask for the majority to join us in this.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MEEK, the point I want to add is this body has openings for people of courage, and we encourage them to apply for those jobs over the next several months.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Job openings.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There are job openings for people of courage. We need a few more people of courage. There are a couple on that side, but we need a whole lot more.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something. That is www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something. Members of Congress can go to this Web site and access all of the charts, see our third-party validators, and see why we are so alarmed at what is going on here in our Nation's capital.

I yield to my good friend, Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with that we would like to thank not only the Democratic leadership but also many of us here in the House who are trying to work hard on behalf of the American people. I know we all are, but I think it is important that we bring these issues to the forefront.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COSTA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and March 8.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and March 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 8 and 9.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today March 8 and 9.

Mr. KING of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and March 8 and 9.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2320. An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 8, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the second, third and fourth quarter of 2005 and the first quarter of 2006, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. GERASIMOS C. VANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 20 AND NOV. 28, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Gerasimos C. Vans	11/20	11/28	Australia		748.00		9,738.62				10,487.62
Committee total											10,487.62

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GERASIMOS C. VANS, Dec. 12, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 2 AND DEC. 6, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	12/3	12/6	Slovenia	79,357	390.00					79,357	390.00
Committee total				79,357	390.00					79,357	390.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DANIEL SCANDLING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 13 AND JAN. 20, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Scandling		1/13	USA				6,457.25				6,457.25
	1/14	1/17	Egypt		867.00						867.00
	1/17	1/19	Lebanon								
	1/15	1/20	France		375.54						375.54
	1/20		USA								
Committee total					1,242.54		6,457.25				7,699.79

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SCANDLING, Feb. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 19, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	4/16	4/19	Denmark		546.00						546.00
Fred Turner	4/16	4/19	Denmark		546.00						546.00
Committee total					1,092.00						1,092.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Feb. 15, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LITHUANIA AND LATVIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 11 AND OCT. 14, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
John M. Shimkus	10/10	10/12	Lithuania	255	1,007.36					255	1,007.36
	10/12	10/14	Latvia	235.32Ls	405.00					235.32Ls	405.00
Committee total					1,412.36						1,412.36

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN SHIMKUS, Nov. 11, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN ASSEMBLY FALL MEETING IN COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 11 AND NOV. 15, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00	(³)					1,664.00
Hon. Dan Burton	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00	(³)					1,664.00
Hon. John Boozman	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00	(³)					1,664.00
Hon. Ben Chandler	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Paul Gillmor	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Joel Hefley	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Mike Ross	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. John Tanner	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Hon. Tom Udall	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Melissa Adamson	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Kathy Becker	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Paul Gallis	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Beverly Hallock	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Kay King	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Susan Olson	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Scott Palmer	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,170.00		2,940.11				4,110.00
Patrick Prisco	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Mark Wellman	11/11	11/15	Denmark		1,664.00		(³)				1,664.00
Delegation expenses:											
Representational functions									2,014.14		2,014.14
Miscellaneous									342.70		342.70
Committee total					36,114.00		2,940.11		2,356.84		41,410.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Jan. 20, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 19 AND DEC. 23, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Roy Blunt	12/19	12/20	Costa Rica		2,873.00		941.31		4,893.45		8,707.76
Mike Caraway	12/20	12/20	El Salvador				185.00		471.94		656.94
Hon. Mark Foley	12/20	12/22	Guatemala		5,356.00		6,376.00		4,242.00		15,974.00
Hon. Rubén Hinojosa	12/22	12/23	Dominican Republic		3,120.00		1,125.00		3,329.00		7,574.00
Hon. Greg Meeks											
Hon. Dennis Moore											
Hon. Solomon Ortiz											
Brian Diffell											
Michelle Hawks											
Scott Palmer											
Amy Burnside Steinmann											
Susan Burson Taylor											
Wilson Livingood											
Committee total					11,349.00		8,627.31		12,936.39		32,912.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROY BLUNT, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, THAILAND, VIETNAM, AND SINGAPORE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 10 AND JAN. 20, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Kay Granger	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Greg Walden	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Chris Walker	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Rachel Perry	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Martha Morrison	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Steve Rusnak	1/10	1/13	India		1,338.65		(³)				1,338.65
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Kay Granger	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Greg Walden	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Chris Walker	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Rachel Perry	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Martha Morrison	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Steve Rusnak	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Mark Wellman	1/13	1/16	Thailand		694.72		(³)				694.72
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Greg Walden	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Chris Walker	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Rachel Perry	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Martha Morrison	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Steve Rusnak	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Mark Wellman	1/16	1/18	Vietnam		464.00		(³)				464.00
Hon. Paul E. Gillmor	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Sam Johnson	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Kay Granger	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Dennis J. Kucinich	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Greg Walden	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Hon. Bobby Jindal	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Chris Walker	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Rachel Perry	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Martha Morrison	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Steve Rusnak	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Mark Wellman	1/18	1/20	Singapore		1,375.00		(³)				1,375.00
Committee total					52,565.66		3,563.50				52,565.66

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LEBANON AND FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 23 AND JAN. 28, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Robert Lawrence	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		808.00		(³) 6,913.69				7,721.69
Thomas Ross	1/23	1/27	Lebanon		808.00		(³) 6,913.69				7,721.69
Robert Lawrence	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Thomas Ross	1/27	1/28	France		453.00						453.00
Committee total					2,522.00		13,827.38				16,349.38

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Transportation expense is for entire trip.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig	7/12	7/11 9/30	USA				4,225.07				4,225.07
			Austria		19,415.03		268.00				19,683.03
Committee total					19,415.03		4,493.07				23,908.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 25, 2005.

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H631

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Helwig	10/1	12/2	Austria		16,078.09		72.13				16,150.13
	12/2	12/7	Slovenia		1,535.00						1,535.00
	12/7	12/19	Austria		4,360.16						4,360.16
Committee total					21,973.25		72.13				22,045.29

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Jan. 13, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FRIENDS OF IRELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 15 AND JAN. 19, 2006

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. James T. Walsh	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	N. Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Hon. Tim Murphy	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	N. Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Hon. Brian Higgins	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	N. Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Timothy Drumm	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	N. Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
William Traghese	1/16	1/17	Ireland		692.00						692.00
	1/17	1/18	N. Ireland		361.00						361.00
	1/18	1/19	England		542.00						542.00
Committee total											7,975.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM T. WELCH, Feb. 1, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dave Ebersole	12/13	12/18	Hong Kong		895.00		7,821.18				8,716.18
Bryan Dierlam	12/19	12/20	Israel		362.00		(³) Military				362.00
	12/20	12/21	Kuwait		136.00		(³) Military				136.00
	12/21	12/21	Iraq				(³) Military				
	12/21	12/22	Germany		304.00		(³) Military				304.00
Hon. John Barrow	11/19	11/20	Kuwait		394.00		(³) Military				394.00
	11/20	11/20	Iraq				(³) Military				
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00		(³) Military				314.00
Hon. Collin Peterson	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00		(³) Military				304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00		(³) Military				788.00
	12/29	12/29	Iraq				(³) Military				
	12/30	1/3	Pakistan		1,117.00		(³) Military				1,117.00
	12/31	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00		(³) Military				90.00
	1/3	1/4	Ireland				(³) Military				
Committee total					4,704.00		7,821.18				12,525.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58 (³)				270.58
Betsy Phillips	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		622.00						622.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58 (³)				270.58
Rob Blair	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		622.00						622.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58 (³)				270.58
Hon. John Carter	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Misc. Embassy Costs											
Commercial Transportation							270.58		2,565.36		2,565.36
							(³)				270.58
Hon. Denny Rehberg	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							(³)				
Hon. James Moran	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							(³)				
Hon. Martin Sabo	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		672.00						672.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		1,161.81						1,161.81
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							270.58				270.58
							(³)				
Hon. Beverly Pheto	10/10	10/12	Lithuania		510.00						510.00
	10/12	10/14	Ukraine		622.00						622.00
	10/14	10/17	Austria		827.35						827.35
Misc. Embassy Costs									2,565.36		2,565.36
Commercial Transportation							2,684.08				2,684.08
							(³)				
Chester Lee Turner III	10/2	10/11	Russia		3,568.00						3,568.00
Commercial Transportation							5,813.16				5,813.16
Hon. Jim Kolbe	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							10,127.76				10,127.76
Hon. Mark S. Kirk	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/4	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							9,054.79				9,054.79
Elizabeth A. Phillips	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							8,595.26				8,595.26
Nisha Desai	11/28	11/29	Pakistan		536.00						536.00
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		440.00						440.00
Commercial Airfare							8,595.26				8,595.26
Hon. Jack Kingston	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq		(³)						
	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
Part Commercial Airfare							3,018.97				3,018.97
							(³)				
Hon. Denny Rehberg	11/28	11/29	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	Netherlands		261.80						261.80
Committee total					24,227.82		20,519.06		20,522.88		65,269.76

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, OFFICE OF SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Susan G. Joseph	10/29	10/31	Japan		278.25		9,020.58		37.00		9,335.83
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/5	Korea		231.00						231.00
John N. Phillips	10/26	10/29	Guam		731.25		7,821.90		26.00		8,579.15
	10/30	10/31	Japan		278.25						278.25
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/4	Korea		308.00						308.00
	11/27	11/28	England		353.75		11,008.95		320.24		11,682.94
	11/28	11/29	England		487.50						487.50
	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		946.00						946.00
	12/2	12/6	Qatar		1,188.00						1,188.00
	12/6	12/8	Singapore		420.00						420.00
Daniel C. Sparks	10/26	10/29	Guam		731.25		7,821.90				8,553.15
	10/30	10/31	Japan		278.25						278.25
	10/31	11/1	Japan		321.25						321.25
	11/1	11/2	Korea		231.00						231.00
	11/2	11/3	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/3	11/4	Korea		142.00						142.00
	11/4	11/4	Korea		308.00						308.00
L. Michael Welsh	10/26	10/28	Guam		450.00		7,044.02		13.58		7,507.60
Douglas D. Nosik	11/27	11/28	England		353.75		11,008.95		213.39		11,576.09
	11/28	11/29	England		487.50						487.50

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H633

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, OFFICE OF SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
H.C. Young	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		946.00						946.00
	12/2	12/6	Qatar		1,188.00						1,188.00
	12/6	12/8	Singapore		420.00						420.00
	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		860.00		9,162.32		144.04		10,166.36
	12/2	12/5	Qatar		1,039.50						1,039.50
Committee total					14,793.00		62,888.62		754.25		78,435.87

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY LEWIS, Chairman, Jan. 9, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Ireland, September 30–October 4, 2005:											
Hon. Thelma Drake	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	10/1	10/3	Iraq								
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Jeanette James	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	10/1	10/3	Iraq								
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Andrew Hunter	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	10/1	10/3	Iraq								
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00						320.00
Visit to Germany, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan with Codel Issa, October 7–17, 2005:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	10/8	10/8	Germany								
	10/8	10/12	Kazakhstan		934.00						934.00
	10/12	10/13	Georgia		295.00						295.00
	10/13	10/14	Azerbaijan		378.00						378.00
Commercial Transportation	10/13						4,074.10				4,074.10
Visit to Italy, November 4–7, 2005:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	11/5	11/7	Italy		1,153.00						1,153.00
Hon. Roscoe Bartlett	11/5	11/7	Italy		1,153.00						1,153.00
Hon. G.K. Butterfield	11/5	11/7	Italy		1,153.00						1,153.00
Douglas Roach	11/5	11/7	Italy		1,153.00						1,153.00
Mark Lewis	11/5	11/7	Italy		1,153.00						1,153.00
Delegation Expenses	11/5	11/7	Italy					3,317.16			3,317.16
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, November 18–22, 2005:											
Hon. John Kline	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/19	11/20	Iraq								
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00						314.00
John Wason	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/19	11/20	Iraq								
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00						314.00
Heath Bope	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/19	11/20	Iraq								
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00						314.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, Afghanistan, Qatar With Codel Murphy, November 22–27, 2005:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/27	Iraq								
	11/27	12/1	Germany		358.00						358.00
Hon. Jim Marshall	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/27	Iraq								
	11/27	11/28	Germany		358.00						358.00
Mary Ellen Fraser	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/27	Iraq								
	11/27	11/28	Germany		358.00						358.00
Erin Conaton	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/27	Iraq								
	11/27	12/1	Germany		358.00						358.00
Miriam Wolff	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/27	Iraq								
	11/27	11/28	Germany		358.00						358.00
Delegation Expenses	11/23	11/24	Qatar					1,416.21			1,416.21
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait					2,564.55			2,564.55
Visit to India, Pakistan, France, November 26–December 3, 2005 With Codel Burton:											
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00						906.00
Visit to Switzerland, Belgium, The United Kingdom With Codel Issa, November 27–December 4, 2005											
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		764.00						764.00
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		1,320.00						1,320.00
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, Germany, the Netherlands, November 27–December 1, 2005:											
Hon. Bill Shuster	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iran								

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Adam Smith	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Hon. Kendrick Meek	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Hon. Tim Ryan	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
William Ostendorff	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Robert DeGrasse	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Delegation Expenses	11/29	11/30	Germany		314.00						314.00
	11/30	12/1	The Netherlands		261.80						261.80
	11/27	11/28	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/28	11/29	Iraq								
Visit to Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Italy With Codel Hagel, November 27–December 4, 2005:											
							273.78			759.71	1,033.49
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	11/28	11/29	Israel		206.00						206.00
	11/29	11/30	Jordan		187.00						187.00
	11/30	12/1	Saudi Arabia		197.00						197.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		186.00						186.00
	12/2	12/2	Iraq								
	12/2	12/3	Jordan		186.00						186.00
	12/3	12/4	Italy		540.00						540.00
	12/4										
Commercial Transportation							7,075.53			7,075.53	
Visit to Iraq, Kuwait, the United Kingdom, December 20–28, 2005:											
Hon. Jim Saxton	12/24	12/26	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							4,503.24			4,503.24	
Hon. Jim Marshall	12/24	12/26	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							3,995.66			3,995.66	
Roger Zakheim	12/22	12/24	United Kingdom								
	12/25	12/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	12/25	12/25	Iraq								
	12/26	12/28	United Kingdom		880.00						880.00
Commercial Transportation							6,230.84			6,230.84	
Committee total					35,993.80		26,153.15		8,057.63		70,204.58

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H635

(ADDENDUM) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Addendum to 3rd Quarter Report Regarding Code Stearns' Per Diem to Kuwait on September 23–25, 2005:											
Hon. Sam Johnson ³	9/23	9/25	Kuwait	1,450.00	1,450.00
Hon. David Wu ³	9/23	9/25	Kuwait	1,450.00	1,450.00
Committee total	2,900.00	2,900.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Please note that a per diem of \$788,000 was reported for Mr. Johnson and Mr. Wu on the third quarter report. The actual per diem for their trip to Kuwait is \$1,450.00.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Colleen O'Keefe	6/27	7/1	Brazil		1,188.00		7,176.66				8,364.66
Christopher Knauer	6/27	7/2	Brazil		1,386.00		6,565.15				7,951.15
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	8/26	8/28	Greece		855.00						855.00
	8/28	8/29	Ukraine		261.00						261.00
	8/29	8/31	Estonia		420.00						420.00
	8/31	9/1	Iceland		422.00						422.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	9/23	9/25	Kuwait		788.00		20.84				808.84
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		327.00		10.42				337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		335.00		10.42				345.42
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	9/23	9/23	Jordan		788.00		20.84				808.84
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		327.00		10.42				337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		335.00		10.42				345.42
Christopher Knauer	8/22	8/25	Japan		816.00		7,282.39				8,098.39
	8/25	8/27	China		740.00						740.00
		8/31	Hong Kong		1,644.00						1,644.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	7/30	8/10	China		556.53		277.85				1,834.38
Hon. Nathan Deal	8/26	8/29	Morocco		890.00						890.00
	8/29	9/31	Cyprus		660.00						660.00
	8/31	9/2	Israel		724.00						724.00
	9/2	9/6	Egypt		874.00						874.00
Hon. Rick Boucher	8/18	8/23	Ireland		1,209.00		3,708.52				4,917.52
Hon. Michael Burgess	8/16	8/18	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	8/16	8/18	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	8/18	8/19	Germany						30.00		30.00
Kelli Andrews	8/20	8/23	Sweden		1,257.00						1,257.00
	8/23	8/25	Germany		260.00						260.00
	8/25	9/1	England		3,008.00						3,008.00
	8/20	9/1	Air flights				6,092.91				6,092.91
Hon. Albert Wynn	8/26	8/29	Morocco		890.00						890.00
	8/29	8/31	Cyprus		660.00						660.00
	8/31	9/2	Israel		724.00						724.00
	9/2	9/5	Egypt		874.00						874.00
Hon. Edward Markey	8/26	8/28	Greece		805.00						805.00
	8/28	8/29	Ukraine		261.00						261.00
	8/29	8/31	Estonia		420.00						420.00
	8/31	9/1	Iceland		422.00						422.00
Hon. John Shadegg	8/18	8/19	United Kingdom		181.00		9,196.88				9,377.88
	8/19	8/21	Egypt		578.00		3,812.80				4,390.80
	8/21	8/24	Jordan		762.00						762.00
Hon. David Nelson	8/21	8/23	Sweden		1,257.00		6,092.91				7,349.91
	8/23	8/25	Germany		520.00						520.00
	8/25	9/1	England		3,108.00						3,108.00
Jack Seum	9/22	9/24	Kuwait		1,450.00						1,450.00
	9/23	9/25	Iraq		0.00						0.00
	9/25	9/26	Qatar		148.00		10.42		179.00		337.42
	9/26	9/27	England		148.00		10.42		179.00		337.42
Committee total					21,257.17		15,673.91		21,200.29		85,764.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, Dec. 20, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gene Green	12/18	12/20	Israel		576.00						576.00
	12/20	12/20	Jordan								
	12/20	12/21	Kuwait		136.00						136.00
	12/21	12/21	Iraq								
	12/22	12/23	Germany		58.45						58.45
Hon. Jay Inslee	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/21	Iraq								
	11/21	11/21	Germany		314.00						314.00
Hon. Fred Upton	11/26	11/29	Pakistan		536.00		8,595.26				9,131.26
	11/29	12/1	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	12/1	12/2	Pakistan		268.00						268.00
	12/2	12/5	Pakistan		440.00						440.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tim Murphy	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
	11/23	11/24	Qatar		347.00						347.00
	11/24	11/25	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	11/25	11/26	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/26	11/28	Germany		467.00						467.00
Sue Sheridan	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Lorie Schmidt	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Peter Spencer	12/4	12/9	Canada		850.00		898.42				1,748.42
Hon. Jay Inslee	11/19		Kuwait		394.00						
			Iraq								
			Germany		314.00						
		11/22	Ireland								
Committee total					10,749.67		11,290.52				20,309.19

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Melissa L. Bean	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		(³)				394.00
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		327.00		(³)				327.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		(³)				320.00
Hon. Al Green ⁴	11/27	11/30	India		(⁴)		(³)				
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		(⁴)		(³)				
	12/2	12/2	France		(⁴)		(³)				
Hon. Melvin L. Watt	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00		(³)				148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00		(³)				689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(³)				333.00
Committee total					2,211.00						2,211.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ Reimbursed the U.S. Treasury for all per diem and travel.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Frederick Hill	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium				907.22				907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Larry Brady	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Hon. Candice Miller	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Laurent Crenshaw	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Hon. Christopher Shays	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
Andrew Su	10/8	10/9	Jordan		153.00						153.00
Nicholas Palarino	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
	10/11	10/12	Georgia		295.00						295.00
	10/12	10/13	Azerbaijan		378.00				690.50		1,068.50
	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
Frederick Hill	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
	10/11	10/12	Georgia		295.00						295.00
	10/12	10/13	Azerbaijan		378.00				690.50		1,068.50
	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
Larry Brady	10/8	10/11	Kazakhstan		934.00		4,074.10				5,008.10
	10/11	10/12	Georgia		295.00						295.00
	10/12	10/13	Azerbaijan		378.00				690.50		1,068.50
	10/13	10/17	Austria		1,272.00						1,272.00
Alexandra Teitz	12/6	12/9	Canada		465.68		802.10				1,267.78
Gregory Dotson	12/4	12/8	Canada		470.42		368.80				839.22
Christopher Barkley	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		313.00						313.00
	1/2	1/5	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
Jon Porter	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	1/2	1/5	Pakistan		313.00						313.00
Michael Hess	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
Ronald Martinson	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H637

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	12/30	1/1	Pakistan		491.00						491.00
	1/1	1/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	1/1	1/2	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
Committee total					27,023.98		13,393.20		2,071.50		42,488.68

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Robert W. Ney	12/19	12/20	Israel		362.00						362.00
	12/20	12/21	Kuwait		136.00						136.00
	12/21	12/21	Iraq								
	12/21	12/22	Germany		304.00						304.00
Committee total					802.00						802.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT W. NEY, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Candace Abbey	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(*)				537.00
Hon. Gary Ackerman	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		412.00						412.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(*)				537.00
David Adams	10/8	10/12	Israel		1,248.00						1,248.00
	10/12	10/15	Egypt		717.00						717.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				9,018.40				9,018.40
David Abramowitz	10/11	10/14	Netherlands		634.68		5,984.12				6,618.80
Blaine Aaron	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(*)				333.00
Paige Anderson	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(*)				537.00
Ted Brennan	11/6	11/8	Haiti		396.00		1,172.20				1,568.20
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(*)				333.00
Hon. Dan Burton	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00				³ 1,523.27		2,149.27
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(*)				906.00
Hon. Steve Chabot	11/29	12/1	Russia		756.00						756.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		86.00						86.00
	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	11/29	12/5	Round Trip Airfare				8,686.59				8,686.59
Hon. Eliot Engel	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(*)				537.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	10/6	10/10	Jordan		254.00		(*)				254.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(*)				333.00
Jim Farr	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(*)				333.00
Brian Fauls	11/27	11/30	India		699.00						699.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(*)				906.00
Barbara Fleck	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		606.00		(*)				606.00
Barton Forsyth	10/10	10/11	Belgium		516.00						516.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		320.00						320.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dan Freeman	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	10/10	10/11	Belgium		320.00						320.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
Kristen Gilley	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	10/10	10/12	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	10/12	10/14	Burma		166.00						166.00
	10/14	10/16	Thailand		204.00						204.00
Daniel Getz	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(⁹)				906.00
Dennis Halpin	11/30	12/4	United Kingdom		716.00		3,616.20				4,332.20
Hans Hogrefe	10/10	10/12	Thailand		318.00						318.00
	10/12	10/14	Burma		106.00						106.00
	10/14	10/16	Thailand		279.00						279.00
Hon. Henry Hyde	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		410.00						410.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(⁹)				537.00
Jonathan Katz	10/10	10/12	Belgium		750.04		5,875.65				6,625.69
	11/30	12/1	Spain		380.00		4,093.34				4,473.34
David Killion	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
Bob King	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.00				7,820.00
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		253.00						253.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Kay King	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Sheila Klein	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	BRAZIL		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Greg McCarthy	12/10	12/13	United Kingdom		1,320.00		7,252.63				8,572.63
	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
James McCormick	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				10,390.27				10,390.27
	10/10	10/12	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	10/12	10/14	Burma		166.00						166.00
	10/14	10/16	Thailand		304.00						304.00
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	10/10	10/16	Round Trip Airfare				7,292.42				7,292.42
	10/15	10/18	United Kingdom		372.00		7,297.32				7,669.32
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		3,566.10				4,103.10
Alan Makovsky	11/9	11/15	Israel		1,600.00		7,900.80				9,500.80
	12/10	12/13	United Kingdom		1,320.00		7,232.63				8,552.63
John Mackey	10/11	10/16	Colombia		1,070.00		1,798.18				2,868.18
Richard Mereu	10/9	10/12	Belgium		1,061.33		6,743.65				7,804.98
	11/28	11/29	Austria		268.00						268.00
	11/29	12/1	Slovenia		201.00						201.00
	12/1	12/2	Austria		268.00						268.00
Thomas Mooney	11/29	12/1	Round Trip Airfare				6,271.06				6,271.06
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Eleanor Nagy	11/11	11/14	Peru		795.00		2,817.44				3,612.44
	12/1	12/4	Vietnam		623.00		6,904.20				7,527.20
Paul Oostburg Sanz	11/6	11/8	Haiti		396.00		1,172.20				1,568.20
	11/28	11/29	Aruba		117.49						117.49
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		594.00						594.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		273.00		(⁹)				273.00
Hon. Donald Payne	10/9	10/13	Liberia		352.00		(⁹)				352.00
Patrick Prisco	10/9	10/11	Belgium		660.00						660.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
	10/9	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,872.12				6,872.12
	11/29	11/30	Austria		268.00		3,617.03				3,885.03
	11/30	12/1	Belgium		711.22						711.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Gregg Rickman	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00		(⁹)				936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.06				7,820.06
John Walker Roberts	10/17	10/20	Austria		252.00		6,225.95				6,477.95
Laura Rush	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(⁹)				537.00
Jonathan Scharfen	10/10	10/11	Belgium		320.00						320.00
	10/11	10/13	Netherlands		516.00						516.00
	10/10	10/13	Round Trip Airfare				6,852.12				6,852.12
	11/29	12/1	Russia		756.00						756.00
	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		86.00						86.00
	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan		180.00						180.00
	11/29	12/5	Round Trip Airfare				8,686.59				8,686.59
Susan Schiesser	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Adam Schiff	12/19	12/21	Israel		362.00						362.00
	12/21	12/22	Kuwait		147.41						147.41
	12/22	12/22	Germany		304.00		(⁹)				304.00
Doug Seay	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁹)				333.00
Gregory Simpkins	10/5	10/13	Liberia		704.00		7,078.33				7,782.33
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/10	11/14	Peru		795.00		2,695.44				3,490.44
	12/2	12/4	Vietnam		684.00		6,904.00				7,588.00
Linda Solomon	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(⁹)				537.00

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H639

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cliff Stammerman	10/8	10/11	Israel		936.00						936.00
	10/11	10/13	Egypt		478.00						478.00
	10/13	10/15	Cyprus		578.00						578.00
	10/11	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				7,820.06				7,820.06
Jason Steinbaum	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00						537.00
Sam Stratman	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(⁴)				906.00
Mark Walker	10/11	10/16	Colombia		1,070.00		1,798.18				2,868.18
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(⁴)				906.00
Hon. Diane Watson	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁴)				333.00
Lynne Weil	11/28	11/29	Aruba		59.54						59.54
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		492.61						492.61
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		171.51		(⁴)				171.51
Hillel Weinberg	11/27	11/29	Switzerland		824.00						824.00
	11/29	12/1	Belgium		907.22						907.22
	12/1	12/4	United Kingdom		537.00		(⁴)				537.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	11/27	11/30	India		999.00						999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00						626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(⁴)				906.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	10/10	10/11	Belgium		375.02		5,875.65				6,250.67
	11/13	11/15	Israel		772.00		6,693.68				7,465.68
	11/30	12/1	Spain		380.00		4,093.34				4,473.34
Judith Wolverton	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00		(⁴)				333.00
Matthew Zweig	10/8	10/12	Israel		1,248.00						1,248.00
	10/12	10/15	Egypt		717.00						717.00
	10/8	10/15	Round Trip Airfare				9,018.40				9,018.40
Committee total					94,929.83		243,245.43		³ 1,523.27		339,698.53

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Indicates Delegation Costs.

⁴ Military air transportation.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 28 AND DEC. 5, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel P. Coughlin	11/28	11/29	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00						689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Republic		333.00						333.00
Committee total					1,170.00						1,170.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL P. COUGHLIN, Jan. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sheila Jackson	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. John Conyers	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
David Abruzzino	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
Keenan Keller	10/9	10/10	Haiti		285.00		(³)				285.00
Committee total					1,710.00						1,710.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

F. JAMES SENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 24, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Todd Willens	11/4	11/8	Palau		1,200.00		7,766.46				8,966.46
Chris Foster	11/4	11/7	Palau		900.00		8,061.16				8,961.16
	11/7	11/9	Micronesia		450.00						450.00
Stevan Pearce	11/27	11/30	India		999.00		(³)				999.00
	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00		(³)				626.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(³)				906.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kurt Christensen	12/5	12/9	Canada		1,681.92		1,428.45				3,110.37
Committee total					6,762.92		17,256.07				24,018.99

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

RICHARD P. POMBO, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	11/29	12/3	Ukraine		933.00		6,596.58				7,529.58
Ana Carbonell	11/29	12/3	Ukraine		933.00		6,596.58				7,529.58
Hon. Tom Cole	11/19	11/21	Kuwait		394.00		(³)				394.00
	11/19	11/20	Iraq				(³)				
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00		(³)				314.00
Committee total					2,574.00		13,193.16				15,767.16

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Feb. 6, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Amy Chiang	9/4	9/12	China		³ 1,896.07				2,302.47		4,198.34
Committee total					1,896.07				2,302.47		4,198.54

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Additional per diem.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Dec. 6, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Lynn Woolsey	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		(³)				394.00
	10/1	10/2	Iraq				(³)				
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00		(³)				347.00
Hon. J. Kevin Carroll	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		(³)				320.00
Hon. Brad Miller	12/4	12/9	Canada		404.80		⁴ 348.33				753.13
	10/1	10/2	Kuwait		394.00		(³)				394.00
	10/1	10/2	Iraq				(³)				
	10/2	10/3	Qatar		347.00		(³)				347.00
	10/3	10/4	Ireland		320.00		(³)				320.00
Hon. Shelia Jackson-Lee	11/30	12/2	Pakistan		626.00		(³)				626.00
	11/27	11/30	India		999.00		(³)				999.00
	12/2	12/4	France		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. David Wu	11/26	12/3	China		2,033.88		⁴ 8,637.34				10,671.22
Olwen Huxley	11/26	12/3	China		2,033.88		8,637.34				10,671.22
Julie Tippens	11/26	11/28	China		746.25		8,637.34				9,383.59
Committee total					9,871.81		26,260.35				36,132.16

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Commercial airfare.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Matthew Szymanski	11/17	11/22	Korea/China				6,643.64		2,182.00		8,825.64
Sean Devere	11/17	11/22	Korea/China				6,643.64		2,182.00		8,825.64
Matthew Szymanski	12/9	12/19	India		2,902.00						
	12/20	12/21	Nepal		476.00						
	12/22	12/22	Bhutan		146.00		7,597.71				11,121.71
Christopher Szymanski	12/9	12/19	India		2,902.00						
	12/20	12/21	Nepal		476.00						
	12/22	12/22	Bhutan		146.00		7,742.09				11,266.09
Rich Beutel	12/9	12/16	India		2,783.00						
	12/17	12/20	China		1,164.00		7,908.15				11,855.15
Sean Devere	12/9	12/16	India		2,783.00						
	12/17	12/20	China		1,164.00		7,908.15				11,855.15

March 7, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H641

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kenneth Shaw	12/11	12/16	India		2,255.00		7,637.43				9,892.43
Committee total											73,732.81

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ CODEL returned \$3,798.21 USD

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Nov. 15, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2005.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Michael Capuano	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00		(³)				254.00
Hon. Mike Sodrel	11/18	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00						314.00
Hon. Mark Kennedy	11/18	11/21	Kuwait		394.00						394.00
	11/21	11/22	Germany		314.00						314.00
Rep. Luis Fortuño	11/28	11/28	Aruba		148.00						148.00
	11/29	12/2	Brazil		689.00		(³)				689.00
	12/2	12/5	Dominican Rep		333.00		(³)				333.00
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart	12/1	12/2	Kuwait		86.00						86.00
	12/2	12/5	Afghanistan		180.00		8,237.49				8,417.49
Hon. John Boozman	12/19	12/21	Israel/Jordan		362.00						362.00
	12/21	12/22	Kuwait		136.00		(³)				136.00
	12/22	12/23	Germany		304.00		(³)				304.00
Committee total					3,908.00		8,237.49				12,145.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STEVE BUYER, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	10/8	10/9	Jordan		254.00						254.00
	10/9	10/10	Iraq								
Hon. Michael McNulty	10/8	10/9	Jordan		204.00						204.00
	10/9	10/10	Iraq		154.00						154.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	10/9	10/10	Haiti		235.00						235.00
David Kavanaugh	12/15	12/19	Hong Kong, China		2,731.08		7,949.68				10,680.76
Julie Herwig	12/15	12/19	Hong Kong, China		2,731.08		7,538.68				10,269.76
Melissa Hart	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/30	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/30	01/2	Pakistan		982.00						982.00
	01/2	01/3	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	01/3	01/4	Ireland								
Kenny Hulshof	12/27	12/28	Germany		304.00						304.00
	12/28	12/29	Kuwait		788.00						788.00
	12/29	12/29	Iraq								
	12/30	12/30	Kuwait								
	12/30	12/31	Pakistan		804.00						804.00
	12/31	01/2	Afghanistan		90.00						90.00
	01/2	01/3	Pakistan		178.00						178.00
	01/3	01/4	Ireland								
Committee total					10,637.16		15,488.36				26,125.52

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, Chairman, Feb. 14, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT W. NEY, Chairman, Jan. 4, 2006.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2005

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, Chairman, Jan. 12, 2006.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6473. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to India pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6474. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6475. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 06-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and Singapore for Analysis and Testing of Braided Composite Structures

and Joints, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6476. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 07-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and Singapore for Motheye Antireflective Structure for ZGP Crystal, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6477. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, a copy of Transmittal No. 01-06 which informs of an intent to sign a Project Arrangement to the Research and Development Projects Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6478. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6479. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6480. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration & Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6481. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6482. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6483. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6484. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6485. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6486. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, OARM, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6487. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6488. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals Incidental to Rocket Launches from Kodiak Island, AK [Docket No. 011011247-6006-03; I.D. 082701E] (RIN: 0648-AP62) received February 13, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6489. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Subsistence Fishing [Docket No. 040607171-5078-02; I.D. 051804C] (RIN: 0648-AR88) received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6490. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; 2006 and 2007 Fishing Quotas for Ocean Quahogs [Docket No. 051017270-5339-02; I.D. 093005B] (RIN: 0648-AT85) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6491. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Extension of Emergency Fishery Closure Due to the Presence of the Toxin That Causes Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning [Docket No. 050613158-5262-03; I.D. 090105A] (RIN: 0648-AT48) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6492. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 122805B] received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6493. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel Lottery in Areas 542 and 543 [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 011306A] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6494. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 011206I] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6495. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 011206I] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

anic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [I.D. 011906B] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6496. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Haddock Incidental Catch Allowance for the Atlantic Herring Fishery [Docket No. 050517132-5132-01; I.D. 051105D] (RIN: 0648-AT36) received January 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6497. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 6 [Docket No. 050314071-5230-02; I.D. 030105E] (RIN: 0648-AS16) received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6498. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allocating Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab Fishery Resources; Correction [Docket No. 040831251-5309-05; I.D. 082504A] (RIN: 0648-AS47) received January 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6499. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish and Summer Flounder Fisheries [Docket No. 050708184-5235-02; I.D. 070105B] (RIN: 0648-AT50) received January 23, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6500. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gulf Grouper Recreational Management Measures [Docket No. 050708183-5183-01; I.D. 070505D] (RIN: 0648-AT45) received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6501. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish; Framework Adjustment 1; Establishing a Multiple-year Specifications Process [Docket No. 051104291-5350-02; I.D. 100405F] (RIN: 0648-AT29) received February 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6502. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2006 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Specifications; Preliminary 2006 Quota Adjustments; 2006 Summer Flounder Quota

for Delaware [Docket No. 051104293-5344-02; I.D. 102705B] (RIN: 0648-AT27) received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; North Pacific Halibut and Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Cost Recovery Program [I.D. 120805C] received February 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6504. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 012006A] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6505. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 011806K] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6506. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 030805C] received February 8, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6507. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Increases [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 012406A] received February 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6508. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 041126333-5040-02; I.D. 012506A] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6509. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall and Using Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 020106A] received February 17, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6510. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [I.D. 020606B] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6511. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock from the Aleutian Islands Subarea to the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 041126332-5039-02; I.D. 020606A] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6512. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Modification of the Yellowtail Flounder Landing Limit for Western and Eastern U.S./Canada Areas [Docket No. 040804229-4300-02; I.D. 010606A] received February 22, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6513. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the Quarter I Fishery for Loligo Squid [Docket No. 051209329-5329-01; I.D. 020306B] received February 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6514. A letter from the Acting Director, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the response to the emergency declared as a result the influx of evacuees from areas struck by Hurricane Katrina beginning on August 29, 2005 in the State of Florida, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6515. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the Central and Southern Florida Project Indian River Lagoon-South Feasibility Study; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 645. Resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States; adversely (Rept. 109-384). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOEKSTRA: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 641. Resolution requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in his possession relating to electronic surveillance without search warrants

on individuals in the United States; adversely (Rept. 109-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 710. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-386). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. POE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 4881. A bill to promote the national defense by establishing requirements for the ownership, management, and operation of critical infrastructure in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, International Relations, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 4882. A bill to ensure the proper remembrance of Vietnam veterans and the Vietnam War by providing a deadline for the designation of a visitor center for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4883. A bill to provide justice for crime victims' families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H.R. 4884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include in gross income the value of assets set aside under an employer nonqualified deferred compensation plan when the employer defined benefit plan has a funding target attainment percentage of less than 80 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 4885. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prohibit acquisitions, mergers, or takeovers of persons engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by entities controlled by or acting on behalf of foreign governments that do not recognize countries that are member states of the United Nations, participate in boycotts against countries that are friendly to the United States, or provide support for international terrorism; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 4886. A bill to designate Colombia under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to make nationals of

Colombia eligible for temporary protected status under such section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts awarded to qui tam plaintiffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. JINDAL):

H.R. 4888. A bill to amend the provision regarding the emergency watershed protection program in the Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006, to restore the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to waive or reduce the non-Federal cost share requirements of the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 4889. A bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. BONO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MACK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. RENZI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 4890. A bill to amend the Congressional and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 4891. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to conduct an Independent Safety Assessment of the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 4892. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to continue to make available to the public on a weekly basis information on the measure of the M3 monetary aggregate, and its components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 4893. A bill to amend section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to restrict off-reservation gaming; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 4894. A bill to provide for certain access to national crime information databases

by schools and educational agencies for employment purposes, with respect to individuals who work with children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 4895. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit the provision of United States military assistance and the sale, transfer, or licensing of United States military equipment or technology to Ethiopia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 4896. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for each durable infant or toddler product, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 4897. A bill to reauthorize the Renewable Energy Systems and Energy Efficiency Improvements Program of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2011 and to increase the annual level of Commodity Credit Corporation funding for the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Phillip Frost as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 82. A joint resolution providing for the reappointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution recognizing the contributions of the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in educating the people of the United States about the African-American migration experience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H. Res. 711. A resolution recognizing and honoring the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H. Res. 712. A resolution commending the United States men's and women's curling teams on their accomplishments at the 2006 Winter Olympic Games in Torino, Italy; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

262. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 30 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to amend the No Child Left Behind Act to provide that paraprofessionals who are employed in Title I schools prior to the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act shall be deemed to have met the definition of "highly qualified" for purposes of such legis-

lation due to such employment and the experience gained as a result of such employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

263. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 32 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

264. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to honor the preferences of local governing authorities in determining the location of temporary housing sites; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

265. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 20 urging the Louisiana congressional delegation to ensure enactment of legislation to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide the same level assistance to the residents of certain parishes who were affected by Hurricane Rita as the residents of Louisiana affected by Hurricane Katrina, including funding assistance with demolition and removal of damaged housing; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

266. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to immediately close the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet and return the area to essential coastal wetlands and marshes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

267. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 26 urging the United States Army Corps of Engineers to provide a listing of all Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita related projects, including specific details including the type of work, the name of the contractor, and the total price of the contract; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

268. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 17 memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to allow a five hundred dollar federal tax deduction for people who housed evacuees rent free for at least sixty continuous days as a result of Hurricane Rita; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 95: Mr. HOLT and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 147: Mrs. NORTHUP.
H.R. 198: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 200: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 282: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 283: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 354: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 363: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BACA, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 503: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 515: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 517: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 550: Ms. NORTON, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 552: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 586: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 611: Ms. WATERS and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 615: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 669, Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 752: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 769: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 791: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 807: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 808: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 838: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 888: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 898: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 998: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1053: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. HART, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 1120: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1188: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1227: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1262: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1345: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1366: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1393: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 1447: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1494: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1498: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1558: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1578: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1588: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1621: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 1649: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1671: Mr. SODREL.

H.R. 1806: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1951: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2045: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2073: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2230: Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 2317: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 2348: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 2369: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2390: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 2421: Mrs. CAPITO and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2534, Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 2592: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2642: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 2669: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2684: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2716: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2793: Mr. OBEY and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2804: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 2939: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 3004: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 3167: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 3255: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3318: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 3361: Ms. HERSETH and Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 3476: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACA, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3478: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Miss McMORRIS, Mr. SALAZAR, and Ms. HARRIS.
 H.R. 3861: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 3954: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3986: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 4005: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SABO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4015: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4019: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 4188: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 4197: Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 4201: Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 4211: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4217: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 4236: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H.R. 4244: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 4291: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4315: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
 H.R. 4319: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 4338: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4341: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HULSHOF, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 4357: Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4364: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 4403: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4423: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SABO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BOYD.
 H.R. 4434: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 4460: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 4474: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4493: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 4542: Mr. HOLT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. BOREN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 4551: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 4562: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4623: Mr. TERRY and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 4625: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4646: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4662: Mr. WYNN and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4668: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. EMERSON, Miss McMORRIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DENT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 4685: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 4687: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 4696: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 4704: Mr. JEFFERSON and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 4709: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 4727: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 4736: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4740: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
 H.R. 4747: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4751: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 4755: Mr. STARK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. DELAUNO.
 H.R. 4761: Mr. WAMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4774: Mr. FORD, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 4780: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CASE, and Ms. HARRIS.
 H.R. 4790: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 4799: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
 H.R. 4800: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 4807: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 4808: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4813: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 4820: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 4830: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FORD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 4843: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4859: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4864: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.J. Res. 78: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 3: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H. Con. Res. 222: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H. Con. Res. 336: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HALL.
 H. Res. 295: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PALLONE.
 H. Res. 316: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H. Res. 566: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
 H. Res. 578: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 608: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HART, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H. Res. 616: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H. Res. 658: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Res. 673: Ms. HART, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARDIN.
 H. Res. 680: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 681: Mr. CARNAHAN.
 H. Res. 698: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. DINGELL.
 H. Res. 699: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H. Res. 700: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 701: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 415: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.